Authorship and Greek Song: Authority, Authenticity, and Performance

Mnemosyne Supplements

MONOGRAPHS ON GREEK AND
LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Executive Editor

C. Pieper (*Leiden University*)

Editorial Board

A. Chaniotis (*Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton*)
K.M. Coleman (*Harvard University*)
I.J.F. de Jong (*University of Amsterdam*)
T. Reinhardt (*Oxford University*)

VOLUME 402

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/mns*

Authorship and Greek Song: Authority, Authenticity, and Performance

Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, vol. 3

Edited by

Egbert J. Bakker

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Bakker, Egbert J., editor.
Title: Authorship and Greek song : authority, authenticity, and performance / edited by Egbert J. Bakker.
Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2017. | Series: Mnemosyne. Supplements, ISSN 0169-8958 ; volume 402 | Series: Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song ; vol. 3 | Selected papers presented at a conference entitled "Authorship, Authority, and Authenticity in Archaic and Classical Greek Song," which was held June 6-9, 2011 at Yale University, organized by the Network for the Study of Archaic and Classical Greek Song. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2016056224 (print) | LCCN 2016058066 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004339699 (hardback : alk. paper) | ISBN 9789004339705 (e-book)
Subjects: LCSH: Greek poetry–History and criticism–Congresses. | Greek poetry–Authorship–Congresses. | Oral interpretation of poetry–History–To 1500–Congresses. | Oral tradition–Greece–Congresses.
Classification: LCC PA3095 .A98 2017 (print) | LCC PA3095 (ebook) | DDC 881/.0109–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2016056224

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 978-90-04-33969-9 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-33970-5 (e-book)

Copyright 2017 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.
Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Preface vii
List of Contributors viii

Introduction 1
Egbert J. Bakker

1 **The Construction of Authority in Pindar's *Isthmian* 2 in Performance** 8
Eva Stehle

2 **Voice and Worship** 34
Christopher Carey

3 **Crooked Competition: The Performance and Poetics of *Skolia*** 61
Richard P. Martin

4 **Placing the Poet: The Topography of Authorship** 80
Nicholas Boterf

5 **Trust and Fame: The Seal of Theognis** 99
Egbert J. Bakker

6 **Authenticity and Autochthonous Traditions in Archaic and Hellenistic Lyric Poetry** 122
Jacqueline Klooster

7 **Embedded Song and Poetic Authority in Pindar and Bacchylides** 139
Sarah J. Harden

8 **Narratorial Authority and Its Subversion in Archilochus** 161
Laura Swift

9 **The Invention of Stesichorus: Hesiod, Helen, and the Muse** 178
Jesús Carruesco

10 **On the Antagonism between Divine and Human Performer in Archaic Greek Poetics** 197
Vayos Liapis

11 **"Newly Written Buds:" Archaic and Classical Pseudepigrapha in Meleager's *Garland*** 222
Irene Peirano Garrison

12 **Sappho or Alcaeus: Authors and Genres of Archaic Hymns** 239
Leanna Boychenko

13 **Which Sappho? The Case Study of the Cologne Papyrus** 265
Elisabetta Pitotto and Amedeo A. Raschieri

Index Locorum 287
Index Rerum 291

Preface

The chapters in this volume are a selection of papers presented at a conference entitled "Authorship, Authority, and Authenticity in Archaic and Classical Greek Song," which was held June 6–9, 2011 at Yale University as part of the annual event series organized by the Network for the Study of Archaic and Classical Greek Song. The Network (http://greeksong.ruhosting.nl) was created in 2008 by André Lardinois and Ewen Bowie as a forum for exchange of research on the various genres of archaic Greek poetry and song.

The Yale conference was the second conference that was open for papers of all members of the Network, after "The Look of Lyric" held in 2009 at the European Conference Centre at Delphi, Greece, now published as Vol. 1 of the series *Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song* (*The Look of Lyric: Greek Song and the Visual*, ed. V. Cazzato and A. Lardinois, Brill 2016). Its focus on questions of authorship was meant to keep the momentum of a yearlong seminar in the Department of Classics at Yale on "Authorship in the Greco-Roman World" organized by Irene Peirano and Milette Gaifman. Of the twenty-seven papers read at the conference eleven appear here in revised form. The remaining two chapters (Martin and Bakker) were added in the course of the volume's gestation process.

The editor wishes to thank his fellow Core Group members in the Network for valuable help in peer reviewing the papers here presented and especially the Department of Classics and the Edward J. and Dorothy Clarke Kempf Fund at Yale University for their generosity in funding the conference.

New Haven, Connecticut
August 2016

List of Contributors

Egbert J. Bakker
is the Alvan Talcott Professor of Classics at Yale University. He works on the intersection of Greek literature and language and has published books and articles on questions of language, performance, and narrative representation in Homer and other authors. He is currently working on a commentary on *Odyssey* 9 for the Cambridge Green and Yellow series.

Nicholas Boterf
received his PhD from Stanford University (2012). He is interested in the intersection of space, locality, and authorship in archaic Greek poetry and is currently working on a book *Lyric Cities: Poet, Performance, and Community*.

Leanna Boychenko
is an Assistant Professor at Loyola University Chicago. Her research interests include Archaic and Hellenistic poetry, Greek hymns, and Ptolemaic Egypt. She is currently writing a book on Callimachus' *Hymns*.

Christopher Carey
is Emeritus Professor of Greek at University College, London. He has published widely on early Greek poetry, Greek drama, oratory, law, politics, and historiography and is currently working on a commentary on Herodotus 7 for the Cambridge Green and Yellow series.

Jesús Carruesco
is Senior Lecturer at Rovira i Virgili University in Tarragona, Spain, and a Senior Researcher at the Institut Català d'Arqueologia Clàssica. He has published extensively on various subjects relating to Greek literature (epic and lyric, Presocratic philosophy, and the novel), iconography, religion, and Classical reception. He is currently working on an edition of Empedocles.

Sarah J. Harden
teaches at Winchester College and is working mostly on Greek Epic, Lyric, and Drama. She has published articles on various aspects of Greek Literature and narratology, is the author of a Commentary on Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (Bloomsbury Academic 2016), and is the author of a forthcoming monograph *The Mirror and the Lyre: the Performance of Poetry in Greek Literature* (Oxford).

Jacqueline Klooster
is a postdoctoral research fellow at Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (Netherlands). She has worked on Hellenistic poetry (*Poetry as Window and Mirror: Positioning the poet in Hellenistic Poetry*, Brill 2011), the representation of space in literature (*The Ideologies of Lived Space in Literary Texts, Ancient and Modern*, Academia Press, 2013, with Jo Heirman), and is currently preparing a book on writing statesmen in antiquity (*A Portrait of the Statesman as an Artist: The Evaluation of Writing Rulers in Antiquity*).

Vayos Liapis
is Professor of Theatre Studies at the Open University of Cyprus. His main areas of interest are Greek tragedy of the 5th and 4th centuries, Greek wisdom literature, Greek religion, and Greek textual criticism. His latest book is *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides* (Oxford 2012).

Richard P. Martin
is the Antony and Isabelle Raubitschek Professor in Classics at Stanford University. He works mainly on Greek poetry (especially Homer and Aristophanes), religion, and mythology.

Irene Peirano Garrison
is an Associate Professor of Classics at Yale University. Her research focuses on Roman poetry and its relation to rhetoric and literary criticism, both ancient and modern. She is especially interested in ancient strategies of literary reception, in notions of authorship in antiquity, and in the history of scholarship and editing. She is the author of *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake: Latin Pseudepigrapha in context* (Cambridge 2012).

Elisabetta Pitotto
is a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Turin. Her main research interests are ancient Greek epic and lyric, Sappho and Pindar in particular, and meter. She published a study about citharodes and rhapsodes (2010) and a monograph on *La giunzione intertriadica: metro, sintassi e performance* (2013).

Amedeo A. Raschieri
is a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Milan. His principal areas of interest include ancient geography, classical philology, and Latin rhetoric. He published the work of Dionysius Periegetes with Italian translation and commentary (2004) and a critical edition of Avienus *Orbis Terrae* (2010).

Eva Stehle
is Professor Emerita at the University of Maryland, College Park. She has published widely on performance in ancient Greece and is currently working on a book on women's ritual performances.

Laura Swift
is Lecturer at The Open University. She works mainly on Greek tragedy and archaic poetry and is the author of *The Hidden Chorus* (Oxford 2010), Euripides' *Ion* (Bloomsbury Academic 2008), and *Greek Tragedy: Themes and Contexts* (Bloomsbury Academic 2016). She is currently completing a commentary on Archilochus for Oxford University Press.

Introduction

Egbert J. Bakker

In the predominantly developmental and historical perspective in which archaic Greek poetry was studied until relatively recently, authorship is typically "emergent." It arises as an authorial awareness on the part of poets in an age in which individuality and personality have come to be recognized and appreciated. Those who composed poetry before this age may not have seen themselves as "authors," since the tradition in which they worked did not allow them to have a personal voice. Authorship in this conception is hence aligned with originality and authenticity.

A factor that naturally enters into the discussion of authorship along these lines is writing and literacy. Oral poems are easily—too easily, according to some—seen in terms of anonymity, whereas the "literacy revolution" has been thought to turn the collective ownership of a poem into a matter of private property. Literacy, in other words, creates or accelerates the acceptance of authorship. The author's name becomes a property label and the literary work a good that can be stolen. The name attached to it can be misused when it carries an authority that some other aspiring poet might arrogate for himself. The task of the philologist studying such named works is to ascertain their authenticity and to detect poems that are fakes.

This picture has changed drastically in recent decades. It has become widely accepted that the dividing line between "orality" and "literacy" is not so clear-cut as early theorists of oral poetry had assumed it to be. The anthropological and folkloristic perspectives that classical philology has absorbed have made us aware of the fact that oral cultures are not necessarily "pre-literary" in the sense that personality and individual authorship is unknown or excluded. Conversely, in factoring in the importance of writing in archaic and early classical Greece we have tended to move ahead in time too fast and too far: just because an individual could write up a poetic composition (his own) does not mean that the written text enters into what we now know as literary communication. Writers and readers in the past do not automatically have the roles we assign to them today.

It is the purpose of this book to discuss a number of aspects of authorship in the culture of song in Archaic and Classical Greece from a variety of viewpoints.[1] Its focus is on lyric and elegiac poetry, though Homer and Hesiod, those

1 The Editor does not assume that the volume's authors will all agree with all the views put forward in the remainder of this Introduction.

© koninklijke brill nv, leiden, 2017 | doi: 10.1163/9789004339705_002

focal points for ancient conceptions of authorship, will come into play in a number of chapters.

The central element in the altered scholarly landscape is the idea of poetry as performance, which views verbal art as a matter of songs rather than poems, things done rather than made. Performance is at the same time a historical reality to be approximated and the main vector in what could be called a new critical paradigm in the study of archaic Greek poetry. Performance cuts across the old orality-literacy dichotomy: the performance of a poem, and hence its oral production and aural reception, does not preclude its existence as a written text, and conversely the composition of an individual poem in writing does not mean that it will be read in silence, or read at all in any modern sense. It may even be misleading to speak of the performance *of* a song, as if the two are separate entities: in its original milieu the song is an act, whether or not it is written down as script.

For a discussion of authorship the important thing is that for the audience of the performance the question as to who composed the song is of less importance than the presence and identity of the performer, or performers, even when the author is a well-known name, such as Pindar: the maker or poet (*poiētēs*) is less important than the doer (singer, dancer) who embodies the song and gives physical voice to the role or roles embedded in it. Along these lines Eva Stehle in Chapter 1 below ("The Construction of Authority in Pindar's *Isthmian* 2 in Performance") offers a striking new interpretation of Pindar's *Second Isthmian Ode*, transferring, in a performance-based reading, the locus of authority from the composer to the members of the chorus. The poem's (in)famous "mercenary Muse" comes thus to be understood in strongly contextual terms, pertaining to the performers, rather than as an author's reflection on the changing status of poetry in society. Drawing on performance theory, Stehle casts the chorus members as the poem's authors, locating Pindar's own authorial voice in the encounter between the text and its readers in the poem's afterlife.

In Chapter 2 ("Voice and Worship") Christopher Carey discusses the role of the speaker in the performance of song in cultic contexts. Surveying a wide range of poetic utterances, he carefully untangles and addresses the various crucial parameters involved: personal vs. communal, the author's presence or absence in the performer's voice, and the importance of diachronic and synchronic factors, including dissemination and reperformance. Carey's overview of the modalities of voice in sung religious settings has obvious and immediate relevance as well for discussions of the nature and composition of "voice" (the author's? the performer's? the community's?) in epinician.

The performer's (or chorus') authority may reside less in the words themselves and their composition than in the situation as a whole, in the pragmatics

of the song as it is performed in its original context. Performed songs were the constitutive parts of what has come to be called the vibrant "song culture" of archaic Greece. Songs served many purposes: religious, ritual, political, erotic, praise, blame, and, perhaps most fundamentally, competition. Songs in their lived environment formed a veritable discursive universe, in which singers (speakers) are also hearers and hearers singers. A discourse context particularly welcoming to the interaction of sung utterances as a special code, a language, is the symposion. In Chapter 3 ("Crooked Competition: The Performance and Poetics of *Skolia*") Richard P. Martin studies the *skolia* of Greek sympotic culture. *Skolia*, Martin argues, become a literary "genre" only when detached from their social and pragmatic context, where they function as "slanted, crooked, para-discourse." Using the culture of the Cretan *mandinadhes* as folkloristic parallel, Martin argues that *skolia* are the poetic reflex of a ritualized communicative strategy of *indirection*. In this way *skolia* do not constitute a well-defined sympotic genre or category in their own right: any poem, whether improvised or reperformed, can be a *skolion* if it serves the performer's purpose of indirection.

Performance, the putting of language on display, is often an act of repetition. Performance is always already reperformance. It is sometimes said that any song, any performance, is the recontextualization of an erstwhile decontextualized utterance, that, in fact, recontextualization is the essence of performance, or song.[2] This is true even when the song's previous performances took place in the same locale as the present performance and are remembered by the audience—say, a hymn in a local religious festival: the new context may be experienced as identical to the previous one(s) by the audience, but there is always a difference, if ever so slight; song is coming from another time and reinserted, recontextualized, in the present.

Such a disjunction between a song and its context becomes more pronounced when not only time, but also place changes. Given the right political and/or cultural circumstances, a song may come to be performed outside its original city or area. Such a wider diffusion may be intended, shaping the song's themes and wording—and possibly its physical performance features, such as dance, music, costumes, although these naturally escape the song's transformation from performance to transmitted decontextualized text.

It is such wider diffusion, the transition from local (epichoric) to global (panhellenic), that provides a plausible scenario for associating a song not so much with its ever changing performers in all these varying settings as with

2 Schechner (1990) 43; Bauman (2004) 8–9.

its invariant composer, whose name comes to be attached to the song as it travels through the Greek world. Authorship in archaic Greece, in other words, is a response to the loss of specific features of an original (real or imagined) local performance for a local audience. In Alexander Beecroft's formulation, "the concept of authorship (…) serves as a substitute for the sort of contextual information once provided in performance through such elements as music and dance, and through the ability of the audience to connect the performance they are witnessing to the community in which they live."[3]

Authorship, then, is typically "international," as appears also from the linkage between authors' names and toponyms: the author's "epichoric" indication signals circulation far from his city of origin. In his "Placing the Poet: The Topography of Authorship," Chapter 4, Nicholas Boterf shows that authorial self-assertions in archaic and classical texts (both in poetry and in prose) tend to privilege the combination of an author's name with a city of origin rather than with a patronymic. This reveals a significant feature of ancient ideas of authorship, namely that authored compositions are associated with their home city and gain authority from that association. Boterf suggests that an author's name being associated with a place enhances his claims to authority and traditionality, anchoring him within the network of epichoric traditions. The author's toponym, as Boterf puts it, "assumes 'panhellenic' performance abroad rather than 'epichoric' performance at home."

Diffusion in space goes hand in hand with successful transmission to posterity in time. But such wide renown and lasting fame may come at a cost: some desirable features of an original performance context may get lost in translation, and the song's authenticity may get compromised. In Chapter 5 ("Trust and Fame: The Seal of Theognis"), Egbert J. Bakker reflects on the corpus of Theognidean elegy in this light, drawing attention to the fact that a song's correct transmission may involve, in addition to mere exactitude of words, an audience that remains stable over time. Central in this regard is Theognis' "seal." The "seal," Bakker argues, is ambiguous between being a "lock" on the poetry and a "signature" identifying it to audiences far beyond Megara, the notional epicenter of Theognidean poetry. The seal is thus a reflex of the inherent conflict in Theognis between the desire to transmit aristocratic values in local sympotic gatherings of insiders and the aspiration to attain panhellenic diffusion before audiences of potentially unpredictable composition.

Jacqueline Klooster in Chapter 6 ("Authenticity and Autochthonous Traditions in Archaic and Hellenistic Lyric Poetry") looks at the combined dimen-

---

3 Beecroft (2010) 1.

sions of space and time, but now from a Hellenistic perspective, adding a diachronic dimension that involves two authors in different times and places. Building on the often observed tension between a striving for authenticity and an urge for innovation and creative adaptation in Hellenistic poetics, Klooster asks what happens if a locally authored tradition gets imitated, adapted, and transferred to a new geographical context? Is it still authentic? And how does such poetry relate to its originator (e.g. Sappho) and her imitator (Nossis)?

The author's identity, anchored in a specific place, becomes a source of the song's authority. The performer, standing in for the poet, sometimes possibly even identifying with him, brings to the here and now of the performance a presence from another time and place. Such is the case with the Homeric or Hesiodic rhapsode. In choral poetry, as Sarah J. Harden argues (Chapter 7, "Embedded Song and Poetic Authority in Pindar and Bacchylides"), reference may be made to previous choral performances. In an interpretation of Pindar's *Fifth Nemean* and Bacchylides' *Thirteenth Ode* Harden shows that reporting on the choral and narrative activity of a chorus other than the one performing the present ode can be an effective way to enhance the poet's authority: the narrative, told at one "remove" from the locus of performance, can be grounded in the divine or in the world of epic, blending with the voice of the poet and thus adding an essential dimension to it.

The authority associated with a given authorial persona can also be an anti-authority based on negation. As Laura Swift argues in Chapter 8 ("Narratorial Authority and its Subversion in Archilochus"), authority can be indirectly asserted, when a strategy to achieve authority, for instance the statement of a *gnome* or a speaker's claim to have access to divine sources, is used for comical or subversive effect. On the basis of a close reading of three Archilochus fragments, Swift shows how the subversion crucially presupposes an audience's familiarity with the authority-poses in question.

A toponym as part of their name is only part of the life of many poets in the ancient conception of their authorship. Poets also have a persona that is encoded into their work, and they are not only "from" a place; they also go "to" places in their travels and perform cultural acts in the places where they arrive. The poet's travels and acts may reflect his work's transition from epichoric to panhellenic, or its relation to other poetic genres and traditions. Jesús Carruesco's "The Invention of Stesichorus: Hesiod, Helen, and the Muse" (Chapter 9) analyzes Stesichorus' *Palinodia* as the instantiation of a mythical pattern, the antagonism between human poet and divine patron, which aligns Helen with the Muses as divine models of choral song. Stesichorus' poetic persona in its turn comes to be aligned with Hesiod, as he is granted the power of song in a metapoetic opposition to (Homeric) epic. A key element

in Carruesco's argument throughout is "chorality," the idea of poetry sung by a collective that not only characterizes the poetry of "He-who-sets-up-the-chorus" but also serves as template for a variety of cultural expressions in the Greek world.

A poet's relation with divine poetic models is also the subject of Vayos Liapis' "On the Antagonism between Divine and Human Performer in Archaic Greek Poetics" (Chapter 10). Liapis explores the relation between human poet and divine instigator of song (e.g., the Muses) as inherently ambiguous and discusses questions of authorship, authority, and authenticity in this light. The human performer may present his voice as authentic, faithfully representing the divine model, or the singer may challenge the divinity's authority. This leads Liapis from the Thracian bard Thamyris to the anecdotal ends of the lives of Homer and Hesiod as found in the biographical tradition. Archaic poets become authors by becoming the object of divine vengeance. This can lead to their death, which is compensated for by their posthumous fame.

An author's biography continues to play a role even when songs have become poems that can be brought together in collections that provide context previously provided by a poem's performance setting. Pseudepigrapha and fakes play a role here, poems proven to be inauthentic by modern philology's *Echtheitskritik*. Irene Peirano Garrison (Chapter 11: "'Newly Written Buds': Archaic and Classical Pseudepigrapha in Meleager's *Garland*") takes a fresh look at the epigrams in Meleager's *Garland* ascribed to pre-Hellenistic authors such as Sappho or Simonides. Rather than seeing them as fakes or forgeries in the hands of a gullible editor or collector, she proposes to read them as creative compositions in their own right, an essential part of a literary culture in which, as she puts it, "assumed authorship is not necessarily an act of deception but a playful challenge to continue, resurrect, and even embody the past." Crucial in this respect is the collection's role in contextualizing the alleged fakes as well as the reader's role as a willing and active participant in a literary game.

Peirano Garrison distinguishes "fakes" (whether in the sense of deliberate forgery or as playful reception) as "primary pseudonymity" from "secondary pseudonymity," the cases where authorship is erroneously attributed to a poem due to vagaries in the work's transmission. One such a case is the subject of Leanna Boychenko's Chapter 12 ("Sappho or Alcaeus: Authors and Genres of Archaic Hymns"), in which she studies hymnic fragments whose authorship is contested between Sappho and Alcaeus, in particular the fragment of a hymn to Artemis commonly ascribed to Sappho (44a). Boychenko argues for Alcaean authorship on the basis of a distinction between cletic and narrative hymns, which she associates with Sappho and Alcaeus, respectively. Her argument thus

demonstrates that questions of authorship and its attribution are related to wider issues pertaining to genre and its local and panhellenic distribution.

The volume closes with a detailed study of a case where we can follow the transition from performance to text, from song to poem. On the basis of a detailed analysis of a papyrus containing Sappho's so-called "Song on old age," Elisabetta Pitotto and Amedeo A. Raschieri ("Which Sappho? The Case Study of the Cologne Papyrus") argue that this document, dating from the third century BCE, is a performance-oriented edition, as opposed to the authenticity-oriented edition of the much later Oxyrhynchus papyrus. Of particular relevance is the hymnic proem preceding the performance-oriented version, suggesting a contextualization of Sapphic song akin to that of the Homeric poems. Pitotto and Raschieri argue for a performance-oriented conception of authorship (as opposed to an authenticity-oriented conception), which is revealed in the "framing" of poems through texts that display easily recognizable features of the author or poetic tradition in question.

Bibliography

Bauman, R. 2004. *A World of Others' Words: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Intertextuality*. Malden.

Beecroft, Alexander. 2010. *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China*. Cambridge.

Schechner, R. 1990. "Magnitudes of Performance." In *By Means of Performance: Intercultural Studies of Theatre and Ritual*, ed. R. Schechner and W. Appel, 19–49. Cambridge

CHAPTER 1

The Construction of Authority in Pindar's *Isthmian* 2 in Performance

*Eva Stehle**

Pindar's epinician odes had multiple lives, or contexts in which a listener or reader might encounter them. There was the initial performance, probably usually choral.[1] Then there were reperformances, solo and/or choral, with their memorial quality.[2] The song had another life in the form of a text, a possession of the family. Finally, it acquired a different life as part of a collection of epinician poems, which embedded it in a new interpretative context.[3] In each life an ode had a different authorship in the sense of an authorizing voice that bespoke its truth, authenticity, significance, or literary quality. The range of authorizing voices included those of its performer(s), the physical text as keeper of the tradition of a family's glory, the poet as an inspired figure, the poet as the speaker constructed from a collection, each having a different kind of relationship with the audience. Because Pindar composed odes whose voice, the famously elusive first-person speaker, is defined almost entirely as a speaker or as arriving in order to speak or performing an action that

* I want to thank Egbert Bakker and the Network for the Study of Archaic and Classical Greek Song for holding such an exciting conference and for giving me the opportunity to participate.

1 On choral performance see Morrison (2007) 5–19; Agócs (2012), esp. 194–201 on *kōmos* (reveling group) language referring to the performance under way. Both authors stress the importance of reperformance, with which I agree, but in my opinion underplay the significance of the original occasion.

2 See previous note and Carey (2007) on reperformance of epinician odes. Currie (2004) suggests that reperformance may often have been choral. Athanassaki (2004) 339 points out that *Ol.* 1 allows for a variety of modes of reperformance, partly because of the extensive use of second-person deixis. Athanassaki (2009) 257–259, 269–271 and *passim* gives evidence (including *Isthm.* 2) for reperformance in the symposium and discusses its importance for the continued life of the ode. See also Morrison (2007); Morgan (2015) 109–115.

3 West (2011) 66 remarks that the large surviving collection of Pindar's poems must go back to his personal collection. See also Pitotto and Raschieri in this volume (Ch. 13) on performance-oriented vs. authenticity-oriented texts.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_003

metaphorically represents speech, this voice usually moved easily from one life to another, its identity adaptable to each situation.[4]

Yet modern approaches to Pindar often focus on identifying the poet's voice in all of these lives. This is the strategy of *readers*. I want to show that we "hear" a different authorizing voice and perceive its distinctive logic if we analyze the odes as performance. I chose *Isthmian* 2 as my example because the demands of its initial performance context meant that its voice did not move easily into its textual lives: the ode's first-person speaker appears to undermine his own authority. In Part I, I indicate the problem *Isthmian* 2 presents and explain my approach. In part II, I discuss *Isthmian* 2 as a performed song.

I The Problem and a New Approach

Isthmian 2 was composed to honor the Emmenid house of Akragas—whose most notable member was Theron, tyrant of that city—and in particular Theron's brother Xenokrates.[5] His son Thrasyboulos is the addressee. The problem mentioned lies in the first triad, in which the speaker refers in insulting terms to purchased poems, which presumably Pindar's were. In the second triad Xenokrates' victories in the chariot race at the Isthmian, Pythian, and Panathenaic games and Theron's at Olympia in 476 are celebrated.[6] But Xenokrates is now dead, for he is spoken of in the past tense. Theron is not mentioned by name in the ode and his Olympian victory is conflated with Xenokrates' victories, so he may well be dead also. Thrasyboulos has apparently not won any athletic victories in his own name, so the poem is not anchored to an epinician celebration. It must be dated after Theron's Olympic victory in

4 Carey (2007) 199–200 remarks that Pindar's lack of specificity about the elements of performance (costume, often location) was strategic in that it made reperformance easier. Exactly the same is true about the identity of the speaker. See Athanassaki (2009) 266 for interesting comments on how *Pyth.* 1 could be reused in symposium contexts.

5 See Morgan (2015), esp. 69–74; Kurke (1999) 131–142 on Sicilian tyrants and their display; Hornblower (2004) 196–201 for Akragas at this time; Bell (1995) 16–22 on the relations between the Emmenids and the Deinomenids (rulers at Syracuse) and their victories in the games; and Antonaccio (2007) for the Western tyrants, the crown games, and circulation between Sicily and the mainland.

6 Pindar wrote *Ol.* 2 and 3 to celebrate Theron's victory. Xenokrates' Isthmian and Pythian victories are mentioned in *Ol.* 2.49–50. The Isthmian victory may have been anywhere between 488 and 476 and was celebrated by Simonides; see Molyneux (1992) 233–234. Bell (1995) 19 argues for the spring of 476 as its date.

476 but plausibly belongs after Theron's death around 472. Snell-Maehler gives "470?" Since the Emmenids were driven out of Akragas shortly after Theron's death, the ode must fall in a period of troubles for the family, whether they were in Akragas or had left it.[7] Thus the ode was performed amid challenges to the family's power and prestige and did not have the rationale provided by a fresh victory. Its calling attention to the possibility of buying praise precisely on an occasion when there was no clear basis for "spontaneous" praise of the Emmenids is therefore startling.

Here is the first triad. I assume that the ode was sung by a chorus, in part because the emphasis on movement, especially the final image of a statue not resting motionless, suggests that the performers were dancing:[8]

Οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὦ Θρασύβουλε,
    φῶτες, οἳ χρυσαμπύκων
ἐς δίφρον Μοισᾶν ἔβαι-
    νον κλυτᾷ φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι,
ῥίμφα παιδείους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους,
ὅστις ἐὼν καλὸς εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτας
εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἁδίσταν ὀπώραν.

—

ἁ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής
    πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις·
οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖ-
    αι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας
ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί.
νῦν δ' ἐφίητι ⟨τὸ⟩ τὠργείου φυλάξαι
ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας ⟨⏑–⟩ ἄγχιστα βαῖνον,

—

'χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ'
    ὃς φᾶ κτεάνων θ' ἅμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων.
ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὧν σοφός· οὐκ ἄγνωτ' ἀείδω
Ἰσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν,
τὰν Ξενοκράτει Ποσειδάων ὀπάσαις,

7 Diodorus 11.53.1–5 sketches the fall of the house. He does not mention Xenokrates or Thrasyboulos.

8 See D. Cairns (2010) 29–37 for discussion and bibliography on the debate over whether Pindar's poetry was usually performed by a chorus or a solo singer. He comes down on the side of the chorus, since the few indications in the texts point that way.

Δωρίων αὐτῷ στεφάνωμα κόμᾳ
πέμπεν ἀναδεῖσθαι σελίνων,

PIND. *Isthm.* 2.1–16

The men of long ago, O Thrasyboulos, who used to mount / the chariot of the golden-wreathed Muses, meeting the glorious lyre, / freely shot their honey-sounding hymns of love / at any boy who was beautiful and had the sweetest bloom / of late summer that woos fair-throned Aphrodite.

For at that time the Muse was not yet greedy for gain nor up for hire, / nor were sweet, soft-voiced songs with their faces silvered over being sold abroad / from the hand of honey-voiced Terpsichore. / But now she bids them ["us," in Race] heed the Argive's adage, which comes [ ] closest to the truth:

"Money, money makes the man," said he who lost his possessions and at the same time his friends. / But you are wise. Not unknown is / the Isthmian chariot victory that I sing, / which Poseidon granted to Xenocrates, / and sent a crown of Dorian parsley / for him to bind upon his hair, //

Lines 1–16, translation from RACE 1997, slightly modified.

The strophe describes what must be symposium poetry. Singers, songs, and the youths who were their target interact in a performance setting that has now vanished, for so the contrast between πάλαι in line 1 and νῦν in line 9 implies. With νῦν the speakers turn to the present day, when, they all but say, poems are sold as prostitutes, and they quote the Argive man who elevates money as identity. Then, with a sharp change of topic in line 12, the speakers begin to list Xenokrates' victories.

Odes "now" would seem to include *Isthmian* 2.[9] Why does Pindar cast doubt on the pedigree of this poem? Among attempts to answer these questions Leslie Kurke's stands out for its perceptiveness and attention to social context.[10] She reads it in the context of the early fifth-century economy and its transition from dominance by the aristocracy to a monetized polis system. She argues that Pindar begins with the older view, according to which coined money is a threat to gift-exchange (*xenia*) networks, then gradually leads aristocrats, through the

9 Kurke (1991) 243 refers to "Pindar's own Muse" as implicated. Some earlier scholars took the ode to mean that Pindar wished to be paid. See Bowie (2012); Verdenius (1988) 126–130 with bibliography.

10 Kurke (1991) 240–256.

example of Xenokrates, to see how aristocratic families can use coinage to demonstrate their munificence (*megaloprepeia*) and so retain their influence.

Kurke's approach is a major advance on earlier views of the ode, and I have learned a great deal from her studies of Pindar. But the imagery of the Muse as a laboring woman and songs as prostitute-slaves seems too strongly negative to be canceled by later descriptions of horse-racing and hospitality, especially since, although these activities do require money, they are not described that way.[11] Instead, Xenokrates won at the crown games because he had the favor of Poseidon and Apollo.[12] The speakers also praise his sweetness of temperament, of which hospitality is the most expansive example.[13]

I see a different opposition at work. Pindar's fragment 123 (from an encomium?) offers a parallel contrast between spontaneous homoeroticism and money/a female:

χρῆν μὲν κατὰ καιρὸν ἐρώ-
    των δρέπεσθαι, θυμέ, σὺν ἁλικίᾳ·
τὰς δὲ Θεοξένου ἀκτῖνας πρὸς ὄσσων
μαρμαρυζοίσας δρακείς
ὃς μὴ πόθῳ κυμαίνεται, ἐξ ἀδάμαντος
ἢ σιδάρου κεχάλκευται μέλαιναν καρδίαν
—
ψυχρᾷ φλογί, πρὸς δ' Ἀφροδί-
    τας ἀτιμασθεὶς ἑλικογλεφάρου
ἢ περὶ χρήμασι μοχθίζει βιαίως
ἢ γυναικείῳ θράσει
ψυχρὰν† φορεῖται πᾶσαν ὁδὸν θεραπεύων.
ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τᾶς ἕκατι κηρὸς ὣς δαχθεὶς ἕλᾳ
—
ἱρᾶν μελισσᾶν τάκομαι, εὖτ' ἂν ἴδω
παίδων νεόγυιον ἐς ἥβαν·
ἐν δ' ἄρα καὶ Τενέδῳ

11 This image is far more negative than that in *Pyth*. 11.41–42.

12 As Kurke (1991) 152–154 notes.

13 F. Cairns (2011). Cairns argues that Pindar contrasts, not poets (or ideologies), but two kinds of choral performance and the expenditure for each: inexpensive (hypothetical) love poetry sung by boys' choruses in praise of a boy, and expensive modern choral poetry, epinician or encomiastic. Epinician responded to an occasion, so was less mercantile than encomium.

Πειθώ τ' ἔναιεν καὶ Χάρις
υἱὸν Ἁγησίλα.

PIND. fr. 123.1–15

One should cull love, my heart,
as appropriate during youth,
but whoever has seen those rays
flashing from Theoxenos' eyes
and is not flooded with desire
has a black heart forged from adamant or steel //
with a cold flame, and is dishonored by bright-eyed Aphrodite,
or toils compulsively for money,
or with womanly courage
is carried in service to an utterly cold path.[14]
But I, because of her, melt like wax
of holy bees bitten by the sun's heat, whenever I look
upon the new-limbed youth of boys.
So, after all, in Tenedos
Persuasion and Grace dwell
in the son of Hagesilas.

Translation from RACE 1997

The same bald word for "money," *chrēmata*, is used as in *Isthmian* 2, whereas Pindar's positive references to money call it, e.g., *ploutos* (wealth) or *dapana* (expenditure).[15] Money and a female are paired here, for, in addition to the man's own "female" spirit, intercourse with a woman seems to be the point of the image of the road.[16] Together they stand in opposition to eros for a beautiful young man as two mutually-incompatible modes of life based on different kinds of desire. This contrast—homoerotic desire expressed in poetry versus heterosexual desire and money—appears in *Isthmian* 2 also, and the parallel suggests that in both passages Pindar is reaching for a powerful emotive image

14 There is a text problem in line 9, so it is not quite certain what relationship the man has to the female. Nonetheless, since it is positioned as the first word of this alternative, γυναικείῳ introduces "female" as the controlling idea.

15 Slater (1969a) s.v. lists the word in the plural, meaning "money," only for these two passages of Pindar and fr. 157 Maehler, where it also disparages: "O wretched creature of a day, you speak silly things, boasting of your *chrēmata* to me."

16 Race (1997) ad loc. suggests that the image describes "one who is devoted exclusively to heterosexual love."

to color a larger ideological polarity.[17] We should therefore pay attention to it, asking what thematic opposition it serves in *Isthmian* 2 and how it positions the speakers of this ode in the eyes of the original audience.

We need an approach that allows us to analyze the ode's dynamic, including the work that the sexual/financial contrast did in the original context.[18] Performance analysis has developed mainly in connection with drama, but the same techniques can be applied to non-dramatic poetry. Erika Fischer-Lichte gives an overview of fundamental concepts, of which two are especially relevant.[19] The first is the co-presence of the performer and audience, who interact constantly: "A performance generates itself through the interactions between actors and spectators." (30). The second is the materiality of performance, which is intensely experienced. In particular the body of the performer is crucial; it appears to the audience as both a phenomenal body and a semiotic body. The former is the individuality and energy projected by the performer: "When the spectators physically sense the energy emanating from an actor and circulating in the space among those present, they sense it as a mental as well as a physical force. They sense it as a transformative, and as such *vital* force emanating from the actor, and simultaneously as their own vital force. This is what we usually call experiencing the actor's PRESENCE." (33, emphasis in the original). The latter, the semiotic body, is the character adopted by the speaker. The two are intimately related, for the appearance, energy, and rhythm of the performers affect the audience members' bodies and shape their perception of the speakers' identity and meaning. In performance, as Fischer-Lichte observes, "the particular materiality of the performance makes the text disappear." (34). By this she means that the text is not perceived as an autonomous entity with its own logic; rather, for the audience it exists only as emanations from and manifestations of the embodied speakers present before them.

Of course, a real performance-and-reception analysis of a Pindaric poem would require detailed information about the event, and we have none. But the approach is a useful framework for thinking about authority in performance, for it forces us to keep performer-audience interaction and the presence of

---

17 See Stehle (1997) 227–249 for the use of gender-coding in symposium poetry to induce male bonding by contrasting it with relationships with women. Simpson (1969) 471–473 describes the contrasting imagery in *Isthm.* 2 well, though seeing it simply as one between good old poetry and bad new poetry, with this ode an example of the former. Nicholson (2000) calls attention to erotic imagery in the odes.

18 Kurke (2007) 157–158 stresses the difference between odes for tyrants and those for private citizens and overall puts more emphasis on the local situation than she had earlier.

19 Fischer-Lichte (2010). The following points come from 29–34.

bodies in mind. One critical difference between a performance analysis and a textual literary analysis is that *in performance* the first person is that of the speaker(s)—here, the chorus—and of them alone. While accepted for other ancient Greek choral poetry, this is a radical position when applied to Pindar (and Bacchylides), although it has been proposed before.[20] Yet it follows directly from the fact that the first-person pronoun is a deictic (indexical), a shifter whose identity depends entirely on the context in which one encounters it. In spoken language "I" means "the speaker"; it is a self-reference to the embodied person from whom the words come, as Émile Benveniste has pointed out.[21] He states, "*I* cannot be defined except in terms of 'locution', not in terms of objects as a nominal sign is. *I* signifies 'the person who is uttering the present instance of the discourse containing *I*'. This instance is unique by definition and has validity only in its uniqueness … . But in the same way it is also as an instance of form that *I* must be taken; the form of *I* has no linguistic existence except in the act of speaking in which it is uttered … . The definition can now be stated precisely as: *I* is 'the individual who utters the present instance of discourse containing the linguistic instance *I*'."[22] This is the linguistic aspect of Fischer-Lichte's observation that in performance the text disappears.

The long-running argument over whom the "I" really "belongs to" or "includes" in Pindar's odes presupposes that the *spoken* pronoun can refer (like

20 Danielewicz (1990) 9 n. 7 quotes Pavese (1979) 27 for the view that in the here and now of performance, when the audience saw and heard the chorus, every first-person form could be understood in no other way than as the choreuts' own. Danielewicz accepts it, with the reservation that the chorus could speak the poet's own ideas. His own study shows that deixis in the epinicians is chorocentric. Anzai (1994) argues for the chorus as the speakers adopting a role as "steward of the revels"; he points out that a large number of the first-person statements in the odes refer to a physical dimension of the relationship with the Muse and/or to movement (listed, 149). Calame (1995) 25 seems to suggest that the chorus is the "I" of Pindar's odes but finesses the issue. He excludes epinician from his study because of its complexity as spoken text (32). I briefly defend this position in Stehle (1997) 15–17 and discuss *Ol.* 6 from this perspective (160–169). See also Athanassaki (2009).

21 Benveniste (1971) 217–222 on the pronoun, 223–230 on subjectivity in language, which deals with the use of the first person. Danielewicz (2001) 49 quotes Benveniste but adds "nevertheless, one cannot forget that it was the poet who wrote the text." True, but it is the chorus that commits itself by speaking.

22 Benveniste (1971) 218. His observation shows that the "first person indefinite," which some scholars have adopted to avoid the problem of the identity of the "I," is a chimera. On this "generic" first person, see D. Cairns (2010) 34–36 with bibliography. Slater (1969b) 90, who embraces (89) the identity of the "I" as "a vague combination of Pindar, chorus, and chorus leader," lists five passages (including *Isthm.* 2.47) in which he sees the "I" as separate from the chorus. I do not have space here to discuss these apart from *Isthm.* 2.

a noun) to a fixed object, precisely what Benveniste says it cannot do.[23] The argument is therefore one that only *readers* could have: since no speaker is present, a reader must analytically assign an identity to the textual "I." Scholars do just that, but fail to note that for listeners the referent is not in question; unless there is confusion, no analysis precedes understanding a spoken "I."[24] I therefore want to stress that I am *not* proposing to analyze the ode in order to show that the first person is that of the chorus. For the performance analysis I *assume* that the spoken first person belongs to the performers and interpret the poem accordingly.[25]

Egbert Bakker has recently discussed this issue through the framework of narratology and deixis. He points out that we need a "narratology of performance" and introduces the term "projected indexicality" to describe the indexical (deictic) features of a text that are not internal to the narrative but pertain to the performer's present.[26] Deictics such as "I," "you," "here," "now," when they point to the context shared by performer and audience (i.e., are external to the narrative), change their reference with every performance. As he puts it

23 Note the assumption of a fixed identity for "I" in D. Cairns (2010) 35: "Thus the voice of the poet needs to be heard through the singing of the *kōmos*; it needs to be there to be identified in reperformance and in private reading; and it needs to be identifiably the voice of a poet whose greatness marks him out as different from the rest … . [T]he *egō* of Bacchylidean and Pindaric epinician … is not to be sharply dissociated from the authorial persona." The passage is a response to the question, who speaks? But *this question arises only for texts*; in performance it is obvious who is speaking. Wells (2009) 28–29 concludes from his survey of metalanguage in the odes that the odes always assume that the medium is oral, face-to-face communication: "[T]he speech event of performance … is *constitutive* of epinician language." Yet he takes Pindar as the speaker—a sign of the tyranny of the reading experience in modern reception.

24 Maslov (2015) reached me too late to incorporate here. He distinguishes the communal choral voice from the individual, assertive poet's voice to locate the emergence of the author in Greek literature. Yet he analyzes as a reader, missing choral speaking as personal commitment (on which see below). He does show that Pindar constructed a speaker whose authoritative self-image could survive textualization.

25 Bakker (2009) 127 observes that when a speaker quotes another, the words become his own. He adds, a comment very relevant to my argument: "The narrator can hide or yield the floor to a character only in writing, where his voice is fictional just as the character's. On the stage of orally performed narrative … no voice, neither the narrator's nor the character's, is fictional . . . ."

26 Bakker (2009) 118 for narratology of performance; 122–125, esp. 123 for projected indexicality. Cf. Bonifazi (2001) 195–202, who discusses *Isthm.* 6.42–55 in terms of the deictic quality of "I," its ability to be projected, which she distinguishes from its pragmatic quality of referring to the speaker.

in discussing the ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι … ("Sing now to me, Muses") of *Iliad* 2.484 and elsewhere, "it is not a now *in* the text, but the now *of* the text, the inbuilt projected now of the performance-event that is actualized in each new reperformance."[27] Bakker is discussing Homeric epic but sees "projected indexicality" as an important feature of panhellenic poetics more broadly, adducing Theognis' poetry as another example.[28] Pindar's odes also project their future lives in a repeated "here" and "now" of performance. Unlike Homeric epic, however, Pindar's odes have a (usually) dateable original performance and move on to other kinds of performance thereafter.

Erving Goffman's discussion of "talk" fills in the middle ground between Fischer-Lichte and Benveniste/Bakker by bringing together linguistics and social performance. He distinguishes three roles included in the term "speaker": the "animator," who physically speaks the words; the "author," who "has selected the sentiments that are being expressed and the words in which they are encoded"; and the "principal," someone "whose position is established by the words that are spoken, someone whose beliefs have been told, someone who is committed to what the words say."[29] The first of these Goffman refers to as an analytic category only (not a social category), since, except in explicitly demarcated special contexts, a speaker is not merely an animator.[30] All three roles may be played by the same person, but frequently, including in important public events, the speaker embodies the first and third roles: by speaking, he or she commits his or her public identity to the views and positions enunciated, while the text of the speech was written by another, usually an employee.[31]

Particularly helpful is Goffman's idea of a speaker as one who verbally enacts a commitment to the sentiments he or she expresses, for it identifies the sense in which a chorus performing Pindar's odes becomes the source of authority for the statements it makes. The singers of Pindar's odes were both animators

---

27 Bakker (2009) 124, italics in the original.

28 See in more detail Bakker, this volume (Ch. 5).

29 Goffman (1981) 144–145 and 226–229, quotations from 144.

30 Goffman (1981) 145–146 mentions a lawyer reading a deposition in court or a translator doing simultaneous translation as examples of a pure animator. In those cases the deposition is there in the lawyer's hands and the foreign speaker is there, so the source of the utterance is both explicit and visible.

31 Goffman (1981) 146. He adds complexity to the "I" of a speaker (147–152) by distinguishing between the "addressing self" who speaks to express current desire, belief, perception, etc., and the past self embedded in the speaker's narration of a past event, but that distinction is not relevant for this study. The "addressing self," he points out (147), "not only animates the words but is active in a *particular* social capacity, the words taking their authority from this capacity." (His italics.)

and principals, for they were taking a stand within the local context on the worth of the victory and the victor, his family, his network of alliances, and/or his city. At the same time, by claiming a share in it they could expand the aura of victory to cover the city or allied elite families.[32] The theme of *xenia*, the relationship of friendship and hospitality that bound elite families from different cities together and whose importance for Pindar Leslie Kurke has so well documented, belongs in this context.[33]

Since the singers of Pindar's odes were acting as principals, committing themselves by speaking in a public venue, their own social identity was important; in Fischer-Lichte's terms, it constituted their semiotic bodies. The greater the victor's prestige, the more prestige the performers had to command in order to praise him persuasively. Indeed, what evidence we have indicates that it was the elite who most engaged in choral song and dance.[34] It was a traditional form of aristocratic display, a pastime fit for the gods (*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 188–206), and they are the ones who had the greatest opportunity to practice it. The elite are therefore the most plausible candidates to perform the epinician odes as well as being the most effective performers. They were the ones who could personally elicit the assent of the listeners to their praise by their own high status, physical attractiveness, good reputation, and/or power, while their polished performances clothed their words with seductive grace and harmony.[35] Conversely, choral performance was useful to the elite as a medium in which prominent families could compete or could demonstrate their support for one another. Of course the singers presented idealized versions of themselves, but these also represented the social values and political positions they espoused.[36]

---

32 See Bundy (1986 [1962]) 65 and 82–83 on the larger community's share of victory.

33 Kurke (1991) 135–159.

34 See Stehle (1997) 22–25 for dance as an aristocratic practice. Hornblower (2004) 191 mentions an inscription found at Kamarina (*SEG* 42.846, p. 245) that records: "… keas [son of?] Thrasys an Emmenid is the supreme at singing among all the Doristomphoi." It is unknown who the Doristomphoi are; Hornblower suggests a military group. Pritchard (2004) 212–222 argues that even in fifth-century Athens choral performance was largely by the elite. He suggests (224) that dithyramb performances were expanded to give the elite an opportunity to build up symbolic capital.

35 Kurke (2007) 156–158 argues that since epinician song has the task of reintegrating the victor into his community, the values expressed in the ode are to be understood as those of the victor even though the "I" is nominally the poet's; we cannot derive Pindar's views from it, but (158) "only those of the patrons who commissioned, the choruses who sang, and the audiences who heard his songs."

36 Carey (2007) 205–208 discusses the composition of epinician choruses in particular (for which there is little evidence), noting that *Isthm.* 8.1–4 and 66 suggest that the chorus members are "friends of the victor, co-evals and status equals who act out of friendship"

But even elite performers could undoubtedly be suspected of having been bribed to sing the praises of the *laudandus* if their performance did not appear to be a "spontaneous" response to an event worthy of acclaim. The whole system of epinician celebration depended on this idea of praise as owed and freely given by the victor's "friends" in recompense for his bringing glory to them.[37] William Slater emphasizes this when he says, "The whole complex apparatus of witnessing, affirmation, appealing, invocation, etc. is an almost logical development from the emphasis with which the poet is compelled to affirm the truth of his words."[38] He attributes the compulsion to the poet, but the poet was not the principal, the one who commits himself to what the words say by speaking them, in Goffman's terms.[39] It was the performers who had to present themselves as speaking truth and avoid the appearance of singing praises in return for money.

Since they were a part of this system of relationships, it is plausible that performances were sometimes gifts exchanged among friends and *xenoi*.[40] *Xenoi*, perhaps including a *kōmos* of the best dancers, probably came to one

---

(207), while other odes mention *hetairoi*. But he argues that Pindar may be idealizing the chorus: some of the singers may have been hired or paid for their time, and even if not paid had various motives for participating (avoiding suspicion of *phthonos*, self-display, etc.). His argument for hired singers, that there might not be enough trained performers, is weak, and self-promoting motives did not invalidate the praise that high-status chorus members enunciated. The idealizing was at the level of social harmony, not status.

37 Bundy (1986 [1962]) 54–58, 67–68, and 73–74 on the "*chreos* motif."

38 Slater (1969b) 91 n. 4, and cf. 87. Note that these tend to be performative verbs in the sense that to *speak* them is to perform the action, which is one aspect of being the speaker as principal. See n. 53 below for the similar view of Indergaard (2010).

39 Some recent scholarship, taking for granted that Pindar is the speaker of the odes, asks how he maintained his authority as a speaker in light of payment for his odes and suggests that he adopted rhetorical strategies to disguise it. Kurke (1991) 97–106 and 135–159 argues that the suppressed contractual relationship (98) was replaced by a fictional (135) *xenia* relationship with its *chreos*, *charis*, and gift-exchange. Nicholson (2000) adds to Kurke's discussion the idea that Pindar also used the lover-beloved relationship in pederasty, with himself as the lover, to depict his relationship to his patrons. Pfeijffer (2004) 215 suggests that he used the fiction of spontaneous praise to cover up the contract. Taking a different tack, D'Alessio (1994) 127 says that "[i]t would be misleading to read the hospitality-motif as a mere travesty of a business deal. Praise itself is substantiated by this social construction. It is as a *xeinos* that the poet *receives* and *lends* prestige to his patron" (emphasis in the original). He treats the claim of *xenia* as real rather than a disguise but sidesteps the problem of Pindar's being paid.

40 Hubbard (2004) 83 suggests that texts of the odes spread because they were exchanged as gifts among *xenoi*; I would extend that idea to the original performance, with a group including the singer-dancers coming together to make arrangements for it.

another's victory celebrations, and surely local "friends" did.[41] A group of such friends or *xenoi* could commission an ode and work up the performance. Scholars usually assume that the victor's family commissioned the ode, but the praise would be more effective if it came from an independent source.[42]

11 *Isthmian* 2 in Performance

I now turn to *Isthmian* 2 in its original performance. I assume that the chorus members singing *Isthmian* 2 were (young?) men of high standing and allies of the Emmenid house whose status was known to the elite of Akragas. At the end I will argue that they were quite possibly *xenoi* rather than members of the immediate community.

In the opening strophe, as the chorus members began to dance and sing, they described the men of old as equally in motion, mounting the chariot of the Muses, meeting the lyre, taking aim with the bow at beautiful youths. If their singing was accompanied by a lyre-player (as is likely), the phrase "meeting the lyre" describes what the audience was seeing. Their address to Thrasyboulos in the first line is their own aiming of the missile of song. Thus the chorus creates a visual relationship between themselves and the men of old. This opening identification will be important as the ode progresses.

But since Thrasyboulos was no longer young, the audience probably expected the singers to turn to a different style for their praise of Thrasyboulos in the antistrophe.[43] Instead, the singers continue to speak about the past but now describing what did not happen then and by clear implication does happen

41 The Pindaric *kōmos* is usually taken to be a chorus. Traveling choruses seem to have been common; Herodotus, for example, mentions (6.27.2) the chorus of a hundred youths that the Chians sent to Delphi only because most of them died of disease while away and it appeared to him to be a portent of troubles to come. However, the word *kōmos* may also have referred to the whole celebration, perhaps including multiple choral performances as a structured element within a looser revel. See Agócs (2012).

42 Carey (2007) 203 and others state without argument that the liturgist for an epinician ode was with rare exceptions the victor or his family. The exception Carey mentions is *Pyth.* 4, possibly commissioned by Damophilos. Aeneas, exhorted in *Ol.* 6.87–91 to rouse his companions, is often taken as the chorus trainer, but he and other named figures may have been involved in initiating this part of the victory celebration.

43 Nisetich (1978) gives a nice account of Pindar's dilemma in writing for Thrasyboulos, who has no victories, and his strategy of praising him throughout the ode, indirectly for his beauty, then for his intelligence, then (combined with admonition) for his stewardship of his father's fame. See 139 for a synopsis.

now, the Muse acting as a profit-loving "female worker." The word ἐργάτις is startling in this context.[44] The next lines suggest what she does now by claiming that songs then were not being sold abroad by Terpsichore. ἐπέρναντο means "were sold abroad," but the verb was often used of selling persons into slavery and would bring πόρνη, a blunt word for prostitute, to mind, making the Muse a trafficker in sexual slavery.[45]

The songs themselves are set into contrast with the poets of old in the first strophe by means of gender-coding similar to that in fragment 123. As they sing these lines, the male performers repeat the dance pattern of the strophe, thereby continuing to ally themselves with the men of old. The trafficked songs, on the other hand, are female, as the adjective and participle indicate—and the noun "songs" is withheld until the last word of the long sentence, allowing images of silver-faced women to surface. Their silvered faces perhaps evoked the white lead that some women used as cosmetic to make their faces seem lighter and pointed to the artificiality of their sexual appeal compared with that of youths (as well as to their price).[46] Visually, therefore, the chorus embodied the profound difference between themselves and the songs they are describing.

With line 9, we get to νῦν, present time, which the last two lines of the antistrophe (9–10) describe. The verb ἐφίητι that follows νῦν has neither an expressed subject nor an expressed object. Terpsichore is universally taken as the subject. The object that scholars usually supply is "us," that is, the audience.[47] But since Terpsichore is the subject, the train of thought concerning her selling songs should continue, in which case the object must be the songs.[48] Terpsichore was not then selling songs abroad; now she commands *them* to preserve the saying of the Argive man. The missing word or two (two syllables) in line 10 may have pointed this up. Those who think that Terpsichore recommends the saying of the Argive man to "us" do so because they take this saying as one that Pindar affirms, a hard truth that must be acknowledged.[49]

44 Wilamowitz (1922) 311 n. 1 takes *ergatis* as a prostitute, citing Archilochus (208 W). He also makes the next point about *pernēmi* and *pornē*. Verdenius (1988) ad loc. denies it, arguing that sarcasm does not suit Pindar's style or mood and (n. 14) that *pernēmi* is such a common verb that it can hardly contain such an allusion. He neglects the fact that mention of selling *women* abroad would evoke exactly that idea.

45 See von Reden (2003 [1995]) 67 for the meaning of πέρνημι in epic (where captives alone are its object) and the status of the person sold.

46 Bowra (1964) 356 makes the point about the white lead.

47 See, e.g., Race (1997) ad loc., who translates, "[b]ut now she bids *us* heed the Argive's adage . . . ." Similarly Woodbury (1968) 528, Nisetich (1978) 140, Kurke (1991) 241.

48 See *Ol.* 6.92 with Pelliccia (1995) 344 for a parallel case; 348 for the case of *Isthm* 2.

49 The saying is similar to a fragment of Alkaios (360 LP) cited by the scholion ad loc.,

As I take it, φυλάξαι (9) in Terpsichore's command to the songs means "always repeat." That is, she both sells the songs and fashions them to say that money equals a male, for that is what comes closest to the truth for them, given that they are being sold as sexual merchandise. In other words, the saying of the Argive man, "money—a man is money," is their song. Implied in these lines is the "truth" that a song reflects the kind of transaction that inspires it.[50]

The chorus members quote the saying in the first line of the epode, at the moment when they change the rhythm of their song and dance. Metrically, line 11, the opening of the epode, is more dactylic than the strophe-antistrophe pattern, consisting as it does of two hemiepes phrases joined by a long and followed by anceps before the final epitrite phrase (D | _D ⏓ e ||). A whiff of elegy perhaps. The chorus' pattern of physical movements changed as well. At the same time, the language suddenly becomes prosaic; χρήματα, as mentioned, is an anti-poetic word.[51] The cynical view enunciated, in conjunction with the other changes, suggests that the audience could momentarily perceive the chorus as switching to a different song. The chorus members could have abetted that perception by using a mocking tone and/or gestures.[52] One can imagine that laughter broke out as audience members realized that this was what a prostitute-song sounded like. Thus, without asserting that their song was not one of the contemporary prostitute-songs, the chorus members demonstrated it.

But what *ideological* difference between a purchased text for a chorus and a prostitute-song did the chorus create by these signals? By identifying the songs with females, Pindar adds a new element to the gender contrast shared with fragment 123 and outlined above: he has the chorus identify the type of praise song attached to each of the two orientations of desire. The prostitute-song is a brilliant image of a female sex object bought for money who is simultaneously a form of purchased praise; it is through this composite that the gender-coding

in which Alkaios attributes it to the Spartan Aristodamos. Theognis likewise complains about the power of money (*chrēmata*) to override other kinds of social relationships, 183–196, and in, e.g., 697–698 sounds a similar note to the Argive man's. Kurke (1991) 249 treats the saying as a riddle to be solved by the audience members. F. Cairns (2011) 26–27 takes it as a "bracing and realistic" message that Thrasyboulos understands.

50 Nicholson (2000) 241 points out the impermanence of relations between a *pornē* and her client and the passive verbs used of the prostituted songs.

51 See von Reden (2003 [1995]) 174–175 on the meanings of χρήματα, 182–184 on its negative connotations in the archaic period.

52 On overlaid "keying" within a discourse, which allows another attitude toward the content to appear briefly, see Goffman (1981) 174–176.

does its work in this poem. As songs, the prostitute-songs are pre-fabricated—Terpsichore teaches them what to say before she sells them—rather than individual texts for performers who wish to celebrate a particular person. As women, the songs are slaves, so each one belongs to the person who has bought her for his own use. A man can therefore buy one to get the satisfaction of sex/praise for himself without having to rely on relations with others who are beyond his own total control: making love to a female slave prostitute and buying praise for oneself are equivalent. The praise that she/it offers, "money—a man is money," is the kind of praise that one can buy with money. Recognizing that, the audience could assign another meaning to the phrase "silvered in their faces": the song is like a mirror in which the man sees himself solipsistically reflected as "man" and "money." To put it more graphically, as the buyer makes love to the prostitute-song she/it reflects him back to himself.

The audience did not need to work out the logic discursively in order to get the picture. By free association, the image of the song as female prostitute and the chorus' disdain for her/it would evoke negative gender stereotypes and reinforce the chorus' physical similarity to the men of old. Thus by contrast with the figure now hawked by the mercenary Muse, the chorus members would appear as voluntary celebrants of Thrasyboulos for his "beauty."

The rest of line 11 then further distances the chorus' song from prostitute-songs. In the mouths of the latter, the Argive man's dictum assures the man who can afford to buy such a song that there is no other criterion by which to measure a man's worth. Yet the continuation of the line deflates even that meretricious praise, for the Argive man "stated (it) when he found himself abandoned at the same time by both possessions and friends." It turns out to be the utterance of someone who has lost all authority. He is isolated as well as penurious, his fate the hidden corollary of the praise these songs offer. But as they sing this, the chorus members demonstrate by their performance that they have not abandoned Thrasyboulos even if his fortunes are waning. Embedded in this last comment about the Argive man and its contrast with the physical presence of the chorus is a distinction between two kinds of friends, those who are aligned with money and female sex/praise and those who are loyal and spontaneous (male) praisers. Thus Pindar has constructed a multifaceted, if impressionistic, image of money dictating the social relations, including sex, praise, and now friendship, of those who value it for its own sake—one from which the chorus members visually and tonally distinguish themselves without articulating the contrast.

But why does the ode bring in the prostituted songs at all? The answer is plausibly that the chorus is preempting a possible audience reaction. Since Thrasyboulos had no recent accomplishment for which praise was owed by

friends and community, the audience could potentially conclude that he had paid the singers to sing a song in his praise. The chorus must therefore demonstrate that its members are not performing because they were paid to do so but are speaking of their own volition and according to their own perceptions.[53] By its mockery of the prostitute-songs the chorus brilliantly maneuvers the audience into joining with it in rejection of money-based friendships and dismissal of songs that can only proclaim money.[54]

A significant aspect of the chorus' persuasion, I want to stress again, was its physical presence, in athletic motion and giving the audience a visually, aurally, and kinetically stimulating experience of harmonious collaboration. Beyond enjoying the sensuous interaction of sight and sound, the spectators' bodily impulse to pick up the choral dancers' motions in their own muscles (kinesthesia) would draw them in and make assent to the celebration of Xenokrates more experiential than intellectual. This is the PRESENCE of which Fischer-Lichte speaks. Anyone who resisted the chorus' claims had to forego the pleasure of participation in the event. In the relationship created as the spectators projected back to the dancers their own energy and rhythm, and especially in a shared moment of laughter-inducing mockery, the chorus' words would literally be felt as arising in the moment.[55]

Yet the chorus still had to present some justification for publically praising Thrasyboulos' family if its praise was to be seen as free-willed and sincere. Therefore, pivoting on its success in getting the audience to share its humor at the expense of the Argive man, the chorus turns in the second line of the

---

53 Indergaard (2010) 302 says as much: "[T]he ability of the laudator to convince his audience depends on their trust in him. And trust is inevitably a personal relation. The presence of someone who can vouch for the truthfulness of praise is required; the success of the act of praise, its *peithō* or power to convince, depends on the audience's faith or *pistis* in this person. Praise is therefore a sort of testimony, and the laudator frequently insists on the truthfulness and sincerity of his praise, sometimes describing himself as a *martus*, a witness." Indergaard identifies this person as necessarily the poet. But, apart from the fact that the actual speakers were principals, committing themselves to the praise they spoke, an audience had no reason to put any particular trust in Pindar's view.

54 See Athanassaki (2009) 265, for an analysis of the chorus of *Pyth.* 1 presenting itself as free citizens speaking to Hieron after lauding him for founding the city "with freedom" (61). Implied, as she shows, is that Hieron must respect this relationship if his praises are to live on in sympotic culture through the repeated singing of this song. As in *Isthm.* 2, a communication beyond what is explicitly said takes place between speakers and audience.

55 See Pelliccia (1995) 305 on the "impression of uncomplicated sincerity" the speaker of an ode often presents.

epode to defining the grounds for giving the family its spontaneous praise. In an abrupt shift away from the Argive man, the singers begin to praise Thrasyboulos' father Xenokrates. The verbs in line 12 are second and first person, the first such verbs in the ode. "For you are wise" is usually taken as addressed to Thrasyboulos, to whom the chorus directed its vocative in the first line of the ode. But it would also have been heard by every (male) member of the audience as addressed to him, calling him "wise" for embracing the chorus' view of the prostitute-songs. If line 11 did evoke a stir of laughter or some palpable reaction from audience members, the comment would appear to be the chorus' response to them. It allowed the chorus members to create a sense of intimacy with the audience, as though they were picking up the audience reaction on the spot and praising its rightness.[56]

The nature of the connective γὰρ ὦν in line 12 in relation to the preceding and following clauses is disputed. J.D. Denniston interprets γὰρ ὦν ("for indeed") as pointing forward, that is, connecting the clause "you are wise" with "I sing …," which leaves asyndeton between line 11 and this line.[57] W.J. Verdenius, Leslie Kurke, and others take the γάρ to connect with line 11 via an ellipsis in the train of thought; Kurke offers: "'Money is the man … [I need say no more; you'll understand], for you are wise: not unknown the Isthmian victory'."[58] They see it as implying Thrasyboulos' recognition of the truth of the Argive man's saying. In that case the second clause of line 12 is in asyndeton. I agree that audience members may well have construed the connection as elliptical, but based on their reaction they could have heard a different ellipsis: "[you see how pathetic the Argive man is] for you are wise." The chorus' first person ἀείδω (12) then responds to their wisdom by offering an alternative song to the one containing the Argive man's dictum. If, conversely, audience members heard a forward connection in the chorus' inflection of the line, the effect would be to strengthen the affirmation of the audience members' wisdom: "since you are wise, what I am about to sing is not unknown to you."[59] In this

56 This could be taken as a subtle case of "scripted spontaneity," on which see Kurke (1991) 113, 137; Wells (2009) 30–31 (who misses the point).

57 Denniston (1959) 446 on γὰρ ὦν here as anticipatory, with ὦν confirming the importance of the γάρ clause; on anticipatory γάρ, see also 68–70. Slater (1969a) s.v. γάρ 3c follows him and offers "of course, but then" as a translation.

58 Verdenius (1988) ad loc; Kurke (1991) 248–249, who cites (249 n. 22) Denniston (1959) 60–62 on elliptical use of γάρ. Wilamowitz (1922) 311 likewise supplies the wording of an ellipsis in his translation: "Jetzt gilt das alte Wort, Geld ist der Mann. Du verstehst, was ich meine, wie es bei dem isthmischen Siege deines Vaters gegangen ist."

59 Snell-Maehler (1987) gives a high point between the two clauses of 12. But there is no pause

transition, however exactly listeners heard it, "you" contrasts with the third-person reference to the Argive man and ἀείδω contrasts with his φᾶ (11). The line is a dense, enacted first- and second-person interchange between chorus and audience in which the two sides agree that real friendship is not dependent on money and that the songs to which the chorus refers here are the older kind, known and appreciated.[60] Michael Simpson points out that οὐκ ἄγνωτ᾽ must allude to songs sung in earlier days.[61]

The singers then begin to recall the victories won by Xenokrates and Theron. The list occupies the last four lines of the epode and continues through the second triad as far as the third line of its epode (29). The locales—Isthmia, Delphi, Athens, Olympia—reveal panhellenic prestige. The descriptions attribute to Xenokrates a crown of wild celery on his hair, honor from Poseidon, being the light of Akragas, *aglaia* from Apollo, *charites*, and approval of his charioteer in a quick glimpse of the excitement of the race. The guest-welcoming deed, fond reception from the Elian treaty-bearers of Zeus, "falling on the knees of golden Victory" at Olympia that follow belong to Theron and his charioteer, but since Theron is not mentioned by name they too seem to shed glory on Xenokrates.[62] Together these triumphs win "immortal honors" (28–29) for the whole house.

At the same time, the chorus' dancing in the second strophe and antistrophe repeats the opening movement associated with the poets of old. The language too is sensuous, as remarked, so it is as though old love poems and old victories are being conflated.

When the dancers get to the second epode, where their shift of dance movements recalls the Argive man's saying, they offer a contrasting vision, continuing the image of falling into the lap of Victory (27–28): "in their land, which they call Olympian Zeus' / grove." There is no break with the lines before and after (unlike in the first epode) and the increased speed of the dactyls perhaps mirrors the happy fall. Wilamowitz comments on the line as a fatuous

---

at this point in the line in the other two epodes, and οὐκ is the last element in the metrical phrase (D) that opens the line, so if anticipatory γάρ was voiced there would not have been a major pause.

60 All three first-person verbs in the ode (in 12, 35, and 46) are singular, and each describes a physical action, so each singer refers to his bodily commitment to his praise. For the interchangeability between singular and plural in choral first-person forms, see Calame (1995) 21, 39–40.

61 Simpson (1969) 472, pointing out the link with οὐκ ἀγνῶτες in line 30, which refers to the house's remembrance of earlier revels and songs.

62 Steiner (2001) 240 notes the eroticism of lines 25–26.

piece of writing to be blamed on the haste with which Pindar composed the ode.[63] But its rolling sonorousness creates a first-line shift in the opposite direction from that of the first epode, now evoking the most prestigious of the crown games and pronouncing the name of Olympian Zeus.

The sexual language continues: "the sons of Ainesidamos were mingled (ἔμιχθεν) with immortal honors" (28–29); "for your house too, O Thrasyboulos, is not unknowing of lovely (ἐρατῶν) revels or of sweet-boasting songs" (30–32). The theme of eroticized male gatherings and songs takes the audience back to the poets of old in the first strophe and suggests a continuation in Xenokrates' house of the old poetry.[64] The address to Thrasyboulos does likewise, for he is apostrophized in the first line of the ode. This ode is the only one in the epinician collection that begins with an address to a human being in the first line. However, as it happens, we can compare the first line of fragment 124ab, a symposium poem: "O Thrasyboulos, I send you this vehicle of lovely (ἐρατᾶν) songs / as an after-dinner (delight)."[65] The opening vocative of *Isthmian* 2 must have recalled such symposium poetry, so to bring it back in the second epode reinforces the idea that this is really a symposium song in the same mold as those. At the same time, the "not unknowing" (οὐκ ἀγνῶτες) also links this epode to "not unknown" (οὐκ ἄγνωτ') at the beginning of the praise of Xenokrates in the first epode.[66] The effect of the references to these two earlier passages is to identify the whole second triad as a love song about victories as erotic experiences.

The third triad further elucidates the genre of this poem. In it the chorus again uses first- and second-person pronouns. It opens with a general statement, "There is no hill, nor is the road steep if one were to bring honors from the Heliconian Muses to men of high repute." With the first-person verb in the following line the singers confirm that they are describing themselves: "May I (having thrown the discus far) throw the javelin as far as Xenokrates' tem-

---

63 Wilamowitz (1922) 312.

64 Athanassaki (2009) 269–271 points out that *Isthm.* 2 refers to singing of victory odes at symposia in Thrasyboulos' house and suggests (270) that echoes of *Pyth.* 6 and other odes for the Emmenids can be detected in lines 30–34. The parallels she cites are quite general, but an audience familiar with the earlier songs could be reminded of them.

65 Verdenius (1988) at line 1 points out the unique nature of the address. The symposium song goes on to speak of drinking, relief from cares, and "all of us" equally sailing in a sea of golden wealth (πολυχρύσοιο πλούτου) toward a false headland. "Whoever is moneyless (ἀχρήμων) is rich (ἀφνεός) then, and the wealthy . . . ." The fragment breaks off, but evidently it too concerned the relationship of those with and without money.

66 So Kurke (1991) 249–250.

perament was sweet beyond that of (other) men."[67] The verb ἀκοντίσσαιμι (35) stands in the same position as ἐτόξευον (3) in the first strophe (though it is one syllable longer).[68] "Xenokrates" stands in the same position as "whoever being" in the first strophe (4), where καλός is the next word. Thus the chorus takes aim at Xenokrates' "beauty" in the form of sweet relations with different groups of people, from townsmen and the beneficiaries of his feasts in honor of the gods to panhellenic groups and his many *xenoi*.[69]

The politics of the ode become overt in the final epode, which again emphatically caps the triad by asserting in its first three lines what the strophe and antistrophe have been leading up to. Here it is a third-person command, "let one not, because resentful (φθονεραί) hopes hang around minds of mortals, be silent about either ancestral virtue or these songs." (43–45). The word "songs" is ὕμνους as in line 3, where they are launched by the poets of old. For Thrasyboulos the command means that he should not fail to celebrate his own family's history, but it is also directed at everyone in the audience; no one of them should be silent about past Emmenid greatness, cowed into muteness because of others' pleasure in the fall of Emmenid fortunes. By using an imperative directed at the audience (although the third-person imperative avoids direct confrontation), the chorus members employ the now-secured authority of their status and independent voices. Their message is that each audience member should do as they are doing and choose to speak openly about the family's glory, unafraid of the resenters and opportunists.

I do not think that the mention of resentment (*phthonos*) here is just a foil; it is an allusion to an opposition that the singers wish to discredit.[70] The opening line of the epode, μή νυν, ὅτι φθονεραὶ θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται ἐλπίδες (43), parallels both the saying of the Argive man who lost his friends in the first

---

67 My translation here differs from that of Race (1997) ad loc. with Verdenius (1988) ad loc. I take the discus throw to refer to the chorus' praise of Xenokrates' victories in the previous triad and the javelin shot to refer to praise of Xenokrates' relationships with the local and panhellenic community in this triad.

68 Kurke (1991) 247 notes this and other parallels with the first strophe.

69 Line 37, "he was respectful so as to have warm relations (ὁμιλεῖν) with the townspeople," is a striking reference to a broader community engaged by Xenokrates. See Athanassaki (2004) 323 on the meaning of *homilia* at *Ol.* 1.116.

70 On *phthonos*, see Bundy (1986 [1962]) 56–64, who sees it as a contrasting foil to the *chreos* motif, and Kurke (1991) 195–218. Verdenius (1988) ad loc. (with bibliography) takes it to refer to others' resentment of the poet. Carey (2007) 203 calls it a trope but one based on elements of lived or perceived experience; "lavish self-praise" would not be considered laudable.

epode and the proclamation of Olympian Zeus in the second, and it is similarly highlighted by the chorus' change of rhythm and motion. The echoes imply that the resentful are the equivalent to the Argive man and that what they resent is the family's athletic victories, but now the chorus explicitly exhorts the audience to reject such people. Thus the first line of each epode vividly isolates a particular characterological orientation and engages the audience members in reacting (negatively, positively, negatively) so as to maneuver them into a final positive view of Thrasyboulos.

The chorus' last three lines include another first-person verb and an imperative. First, with "I did not make (οὐκ … ἐργασάμαν) [these songs] to be inert" (46), the chorus members claim to be the authors of the ode, which they are, both in the sense that they have given it a life by presenting its ideological claims as their own speech, with the authority of their identities behind it, and also in the sense that by dancing they have made it a fully-realized entity that can now be recreated in other times and places.[71]

Then the last two lines address an unknown Nikasippos: "Distribute these, Nikasippos, whenever you come to my honored guest-friend."[72] The lines are usually read as Pindar's address to the man who is to take the finished ode to Thrasyboulos.[73] In performance, however, the reference is to the future relative to the "now" of the performance. Thus the lines project a continued life for the ode now that it has been given its public performance and made known to all as the singers' gift to Thrasyboulos. Nikasippos must therefore be someone who could enable reperformances; possibly he was the *xenos* of Thrasyboulos who commissioned the ode, organized the original performance, and recruited these singers from among his friends. In that case, the chorus members are acknowledging him as their *chorēgos* while also identifying themselves as equally *xenoi* of Thrasyboulos.[74] The reperformances they refer to would most likely be by Thrasyboulos' friends from texts or tutoring that he supplied,

---

71 Cf. *Nem.* 5.1–3, where the same image is used and the song is requested to travel *from* Aegina on every ship; the chorus is sending it off through its own performance.

72 The subjunctive protasis with the main-clause imperative can refer to one future occasion or to multiple occasions, as I take it here. See Kühner-Gerth (1898) § 567.2, 4 (pp. 447–449); § 575.1 (pp. 474–475).

73 See Kurke (1991) 251. Race (1997) 147 describes him thus. Cf. Slater (1969b) 88. Bell (1995) 25–27 suggests that "Nikasippos" is a nickname for Nikomachos and that he brought Pindar's poem back to Sicily. He also takes the ode as a personal address by Pindar to Thrasyboulos.

74 Carey (2007) 209–210 stresses that the elite who participated in the games were an "international aristocracy" (attributing the formulation to Wade-Gery).

or perhaps by Nikasippos himself, in the symposium. The chorus is thus suggesting that ode should become the defining view of Thrasyboulos, drowning out the insults of the *phthoneroi*.

Pindar has created a new sub-genre for the occasion, one resembling erotic poems but celebrating the memory of the lavish *xenia* and major athletic victories of the father as a reason to honor the son. And since it did not celebrate a fresh victory, it was perfectly adapted to becoming a standard symposium song, in which case its opening scene would appear to be replicated in the scene of performance and provide a further way of distinguishing this song from the prostitute-songs of the first triad. Once the chorus had publically presented it, further performances would be memorial of the first occasion as well as the committed speech of the singer. Tradition would then reinforce his authority.

It now appears that in the original performance the real issue was not the source of the poem or the status of poems written by professionals; it was about the motivation for the praise being uttered by the chorus members in the particular circumstances. The chorus deflects the idea of mercenary praise onto a type of songs that it then mocks, thereby disguising the actual threat while neutralizing it. As a result, however, Pindar as speaker of the textual version appears to offer a negative characterization of poetry that could be identified with his own. Without the presence (and the PRESENCE) of the chorus, with all the vocal effects and non-verbal interaction with the audience that its performance allows, the opposition established between the speaker(s) and the prostitute poems is lost to sight. This poem's voice does not travel so easily through its other lives.

In its original context a Pindaric ode was always political in that it took a position on matters of local interest and used the sensual power of performance to persuade an audience to embrace the same view—an aspect that appears only when the performers are identified as the principals, that is, the authoritative speakers. However, this does not mean that Pindar was only a speech-writer of sorts. His poetic genius consisted in part in creating poems with a self-referential speaker whose assertive "personality" did not rely on performers to embody it (although they did) but could give a powerful impression of presence from within the text itself. Thus Pindar appears to *readers* as the inspired, morally self-conscious speaker whose personal authority animates the text.

Bibliography

Agócs, P. 2012. "Performance and Genre: Reading Pindar's κῶμοι." In *Reading the Victory Ode*, ed. P. Agócs, C. Carey, and R. Rawles, 191–223. Cambridge.

Antonaccio, C. 2007. "Elite Mobility in the West." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, ed. S. Hornblower and C. Morgan, 265–285. Oxford.

Anzai, M. 1994. "First-Person Forms in Pindar: A Re-examination." BICS 39: 141–150.

Athanassaki, L. 2004. "Deixis, Performance, and Poetics in Pindar's *First Olympian Ode*." *Arethusa* 37: 317–341.

Athanassaki, L. 2009. "Narratology, Deixis, and the Performance of Choral Lyric: On Pindar's *First Pythian Ode*." In *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, ed. J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos, 241–273. Berlin.

Bakker, E.J. 2009. "Homer, Odysseus, and the Narratology of Performance." In *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, ed. J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos, 117–136. Berlin.

Bell, M, III. 1995. "The Motya Charioteer and Pindar's 'Isthmian 2'." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 40: 1–42.

Benveniste, É. 1971. *Problems in General Linguistics*. Tr. M.E. Meek. Coral Gables.

Bonifazi, A. 2001. *Mescolare un cratere di canti. Pragmatica della poesia epinicia in Pindaro*. Turin.

Bowie, E. 2012. "Epinicians and 'Patrons'." In *Reading the Victory Ode*, ed. P. Agócs, C. Carey, and R. Rawles, 83–92. Cambridge.

Bowra, C.M. 1964. *Pindar*. Oxford.

Bundy, E. 1986 [1962]. *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley.

Cairns, D.L., ed. 2010. *Bacchylides: Five Epinician Odes (3, 5, 9, 11, 13)*. Cambridge.

Cairns, F. 2011. "Money and the Poet: The First Stasimon of Pindar *Isthmian* 2." *Mnemosyne* 64: 21–36.

Calame, C. 1995. *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece*. Tr. J. Orion. Ithaca.

Carey, C. 2007. "Pindar, Place, and Performance." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, ed. S. Hornblower and C. Morgan, 199–210. Oxford.

Currie, B. 2004. "Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes." In *Oral Performance and Its Context*, ed. C.J. Mackie, 49–69. Leiden.

D'Alessio, G.B. 1994. "First-Person Problems in Pindar." BICS 39: 117–139.

Danielewicz, J. 1990. "*Deixis* in Greek Choral Lyric." QUCC 34: 7–17.

Danielewicz, J. 2001. "Metatext and Its Functions in Greek Lyric Poetry." In *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics*, ed. S.J. Harrison, 46–61. Oxford.

Denniston, J.D. 1959. *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. Oxford.

Fischer-Lichte, E. 2010. "Performance as Event—Reception as Transformation." In *Theorising Performance*, ed. E. Hall and S. Harrop, 29–42. London.

Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia.

Hornblower, S. 2004. *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*. Oxford.

Hubbard, T.K. 2004. "The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric: Pan-Hellenism, Reperformance, Written Texts." In *Oral Performance and Its Context*, ed. C.J. Mackie, 71–93. Leiden.

Indergaard, H. 2010. "Thebes, Aegina, and the Temple of Aphaia: A Reading of Pindar's *Isthmian* 6." In *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century* BC, ed. D. Fearn, 294–322. Oxford.

Kühner, R., and B. Gerth. 1898. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Part Two, 3rd ed. 2 vols. Hannover and Leipzig.

Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca.

Kurke, L. 1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton.

Kurke, L. 2007. "Archaic Greek Poetry." In *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece*, ed. H.A. Shapiro, 141–168. Cambridge.

Maslov, B. 2015. *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature*. Cambridge.

Molyneux, J. 1992. *Simonides: A Historical Study*. Wauconda.

Morgan, K. 2015. *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century* B.C. Oxford.

Morrison, A.D. 2007. *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes*. BICS *Suppl.* 95.

Nicholson, N. 2000. "Pederastic Poets and Adult Patrons in Late Archaic Lyric." *CW* 93: 235–259.

Nisetich, F. 1978. "Convention and Occasion in *Isthmian* 2." *CSCA* 10: 133–156.

Pavese, C.O. 1979. *La lirica corale greca: Alcmane, Simonide, Pindaro, Bacchilide* I. Rome.

Pelliccia, H. 1995. *Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and Pindar*. Göttingen.

Pfeijffer, I.L. 2004. "Pindar and Bacchylides." In *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, vol. 1, ed. I.J.F. de Jong, R. Nünlist, and A. Bowie, 213–232. Leiden.

Pritchard, D. 2004. "Kleisthenes, Participation, and the Dithyrambic Contests of Late Archaic and Classical Athens." *Phoenix* 58: 208–228.

Race, W., ed. 1997. *Pindar*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA.

Simpson, M. 1969. "The Chariot and the Bow as Metaphors for Poetry in Pindar." *TAPA* 100: 437–473.

Slater, W.J., ed. 1969a. *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin.

Slater, W.J. 1969b. "Futures in Pindar." *CQ* 19: 86–94.

Snell, B., and H. Maehler, ed. 1987. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*. 2 vols. Leipzig.

Stehle, E. 1997. *Performance and Gender: Nondramatic Poetry in its Setting*. Princeton.

Steiner, D.T. 2001. *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*. Princeton.

Verdenius, W.J. 1988. *Commentaries on Pindar*, vol. 2. Leiden.

von Reden, S. 2003 [1995]. *Exchange in Ancient Greece*. London.

Wells, J.B. 2009. *Pindar's Verbal Art: An Ethnographic Study of Epinician Style*. Washington.

West, M.L. 2011. "Pindar as a Man of Letters." In *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons*, ed. D. Obbink and R. Rutherford, 50–68. Oxford.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. 1922. *Pindaros*. Berlin.

Woodbury, L. 1968. "Pindar and the Mercenary Muse: *Isthm.* 2.1–13." *TAPA* 99: 527–542.

CHAPTER 2

Voice and Worship

Christopher Carey

My theme in this chapter is the role played by voice in the context of cult song. By voice I mean specifically the identity constructed by the text. The act of speaking is never neutral, even where the speaker remains unidentified. All communication at any level either generates or presupposes a relationship. Communication between human and divine carries its own specific problems, since the risks attached to failed communication are intensified by the power ratio between speaker and recipient and by the context of communication, whether there is an explicit request or the speech act is designed more generally to create or sustain the correct contact between human and divine. Individual and collective acts of worship do not differ fundamentally in this respect. There is however a difference in the voice (if not the tone) adopted by the worshipper. The performer of solo hymn or prayer requires no special permission. Whether or not the speaking voice accurately reflects either the facts of the situation or the character of the worshipper, desire or need[1] is all the authority that is required.

In collective worship the situation is different. The speaker is not an autonomous voice but an intermediary between the group and the addressee; the construction of the relationship between the speaker and the group, and with it the identity of the speaker, is therefore a matter of crucial importance. Some excellent recent research has examined the politics of self-representation in Greek songs for the gods; my interest is more in the poetics of self-representation, the strategies available and the factors which influence the choice.

The establishment of authority is essentially a process of negotiation made up of a combination of elements. One of these is time. Address to divinity usually locates the individual act in a larger frame, mapped out on both vertical and horizontal axes. The vertical axis locates the single instance in a diachronic sequence of words and acts over time past; the horizontal axis places it within

1 Desire, e.g., Alc. fr. 308V.1–2: χαῖρε, Κυλλάνας ὀ μέδεις, σὲ γάρ μοι | θῦμος ὔμνην, "Hail, lord of Kyllene, for you I desire to sing …" Need, e.g., Sapph. fr. 1V.1–5: πο]ικιλόθρο[ν' ἀθανάτ' Ἀφρόδιτα, | παῖ] Δ[ί]ος δολ[όπλοκε, λίσσομαί σε, | μή μ'] ἄσαισι [μηδ' ὀνίαισι δάμνα, | πότν]ια, θῦ[μον, | ἀλλ]ὰ τυίδ' ἔλ[θ' … "Immortal Aphrodite throned in beauty, Daughter of Zeus, weaver of wiles, I beg you, not with heartaches and pains to crush my spirit, mistress, but come here …"

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_004

a context of human society and divine power. The diachronic dynamics of public prayer are in essence the same as those for private prayer. In private prayer (at least in our literary texts) the right to make the request is based on an established relationship, which, in an appeal to the past, tends to come in the form "if ever in the past …" etc. (as in Sappho fr. 1). In public worship the vertical axis is a collective one and is regularly (implicitly or explicitly) more structured. One recurrent and much stressed aspect of *deixis* in cult song is to represent the individual moment as a re-enactment rather than just enactment, giving the current moment the reinforcement of tradition. This sense of creation as recreation can be seen for instance in the way the speaker places his song in a recurrent moment at the opening of Pindar *Pae.* 6, where the performative present is identified as a special and recurrent moment in time:[2]

> Πρὸς Ὀλυμπίου Διός σε, χρυσέα
>   κλυτόμαντι Πυθοῖ,
> λίσσομαι Χαρίτεσ-
>   σίν τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτᾳ,
> ἐν ζαθέῳ με δέξαι χρόνῳ
> ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν·
>
> PINDAR *Pae.* 6 = fr. 52f.1–6

> By Olympian Zeus, golden Pytho famed for prophecy,
> I beg you with the Charites and Aphrodite,
> receive me at the sacred time,
> the tuneful spokesman of the Pierides.

---

2 The gesture is a common one, e.g., Pind. *Pae.* 3 = fr. 52c.13–17: τ[ὶ]ν δέ, χρυσο[| ὥριον ποτὶ χρόνον [| θεᾶς θ' ἑλικάμπυκ[ος | ἐλαύν[ε]ις ἀν' ἀμβροτ[| φαεννὸς αἰθήρ … "to you, gold[en … | to the seasonal time … | of the goddess with the circled headband | you drive over the immortal … | shining star …" So also probably Pind. *Pae.* 4 = fr. 52d.10–13:]άλλεται |]ν χρόνον ὀρνύει |] Δᾶλον ἀγακλέα |] Χάρισι· "…… urges on the time | … famous Delos | … with/to the Charites." See also Pind. fr. 75.13–19: ἐναργέα τ' ἔμ' ὥτε μάντιν οὐ λανθάνει, | φοινικοεάνων ὁπότ' οἰχθέντος Ὡρᾶν θαλάμου | εὔοδμον ἐπάγοισιν ἔαρ φυτὰ νεκτάρεα. | τότε βάλλεται, τότ' ἐπ' ἀμβρόταν χθόν' ἐραταί | ἴων φόβαι, ῥόδα τε κόμαισι μείγνυται, | ἀχεῖ τ' ὀμφαὶ μελέων σὺν αὐλοῖς, | οἰχνεῖ τε Σεμέλαν ἑλικάμπυκα χοροί.

The clear signs I do not miss, like a seer, | when with the chamber of the purple-clad Seasons opened | the nectared plants bring in fragrant spring, | then, then are cast on the immortal ground | the tresses of violets and roses mingle in the hair | and voices of songs echo with the pipes | and the circling dances go to honour Semele.

This sense of diachronic continuity can be generated in other ways. Bacchylides elegantly uses what Henrichs[3] has called choral projection to make his own song a re-enactment of the wedding song sung for Idas and Marpessa (20.1–5):

Σπάρτᾳ ποτ' ἐν ε[ὐρυχόρῳ]
ξανθαὶ Λακεδα[ίμονι ...]
τοιόνδε μέλος κ[...]
ὅτ' ἄγετο καλλιπά[ρᾳον]
κόραν θρασυκάρ[διος Ἴδας]

In Sparta with its wide dancing grounds once
the blond girls ...
a song like this ...
when bold-hearted Idas took as bride
the fine-cheeked maiden ...

Yet another variation is given by Corinna, who locates her authority in the stories told, which come from the *pateres*:

ἐπί με Τερψιχόρα [
καλὰ ϝεροῖ' ἀισομ[έναν
Ταναγρίδεσσι λε[υκοπέπλυς
μέγα δ' ἐμῆς γέγ[αθε πόλις
λιγοθροκω[τί]λυ[ς ἐνοπῆς.
ὅττι γὰρ μεγαλ.[
ψευδ[.]σ.[.]αδομε[
.[.]. .ω γῆαν εὐρού[χορον
λόγια δ' **ἐπ πατέρω**[ν
κοσμείσασα Ϝιδιο[
παρθ[έ]νυσι κατα[
πο]λλὰ μὲν Καφ[ισὸν ἰών-
γ' ἀρχ]αγὸν κόσμ[εισα λόγυ]ς

CORINNA fr. 655 *PMG*.1–13

Terpsichora set me ...
to sing lovely songs

3 Henrichs (1996).

to the white-robed women of Tanagra
and my city rejoices deeply
at the shrill-cosseting voices.
For whatever great ...
false ...
.... earth with its broad dancing grounds
adorning tales *from our fathers' time*
my own ...
for the maidens ...
Often adorning Kephisos
the leader with words I ...

The same ploy recurs in Isyllos' *Paean to Apollo and Asklepios*, who ascribes his narrative to the *progonoi*:

ἰεπαιᾶνα θεὸν ἀείσατε λαοί,
ζαθέας ἐνναέται τᾶσδ' Ἐπιδαύρου.
ὧδε γὰρ φάτις ἐνέπουσ' ἤλυθ' ἐς ἀκοὰς
προγόνων ἁμετέρων, ὦ Φοῖβε Ἀπόλλων.
IG iv^2 1.128, 37–56, lines 1–4

Sing people the god of the paian cry,
inhabitants of this sacred land of Epidauros.
For thus the account has come to our ears
from our ancestors, Phoibos Apollo.

This is not an exclusive property of civic song; it finds a place in the victory ode. The difference however is illuminating. The *laudator* in the epinician seeks the support of tradition; but he seeks it for the specific features of his song, as in Pindar's *Third Pythian*:[4]

εἰ δὲ λόγων συνέμεν κορυφάν, Ἱέρων,
ὀρθὰν ἐπίστᾳ, μανθάνων οἶσθα προτέρων

4 Cf. Pind. *N.* 3.52–54: λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων | ἔπος ἔχω· βαθυμῆτα Χίρων τράφε λιθίνῳ | Ἰάσον' ἔνδον τέγει, καὶ ἔπειτεν Ἀσκλαπιόν ... "This utterance of men of former times | I have. Deeply wise Cheiron reared in his rocky | home Jason, and then Asklepios ..." Appeal to authority for support is not the only option; authority can be evoked in order to be contested as at Pind. *O.*1.36: υἱὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ' ἀντία προτέρων φθέγξομαι ... "Son of Tantalos, against earlier accounts I will say that you ..."

ἓν παρ᾽ ἐσλὸν πήματα σύνδυο δαίονται βροτοῖς
ἀθάνατοι.

PIND. *P.* 3.80–82

If you grasp the right sum of my words, Hieron,
you know having learned from those before,
for one good the gods dole out two pains
for mortals.

In contrast, in the context of cult song the appeal to tradition has an emblematic place, which locates the current narrative as a whole in a long sequence of tellings which validate its content.

Side by side with this identification of the speaking voice with a tradition is a horizontal inclusiveness which defines and constitutes the group and in the process empowers the speaker as representative of the group. Inevitably the modern reader's eye is drawn to overt speaker-definition and explicit gestures of authority. But though *ego* statements are the most obvious sources of voice, they are not the only ones. In strictly formal terms some, perhaps many, songs in Greek festivals were actually voiceless and any formal authority is extra-textual. This is often true of the circular dance.[5] Many songs in this class evidently consisted of free-floating narratives without a deictic frame locating song in context. In these cases the performative context is itself the source of authority. By context I mean occasion (place, festival, civic organization, and funding) and also performative mode, since with rare exceptions, essentially late arrivals in the song-culture environment, the choral voice is the voice of the *polis* at worship. The performed song in such cases (either on its own or with others in an aggregated or competitive performance framework) is a speech act offered as an object of beauty, an *agalma* (to use Pulleyn's term[6]), to the god. This sense of the song itself as a gift is one commonly articulated in Pindar in those victory odes which incorporate a dedicatory gesture and is brought out clearly by a ritual moment in Pindar's *Eight Nemean*, where the song is an adornment offered to divinity:

5 I am using the notion of the *kyklios choros* here in the larger sense proposed by David Fearn as a generic term for civic song deployable in a variety of cults, of which the dithyramb, the form most commonly invoked in this context, is a sub-category; see Fearn (2007) ch. 3.

6 See Pulleyn (1998) 49.

ἱκέτας Αἰακοῦ
    σεμνῶν γονάτων πόλιός θ’ ὑπὲρ φίλας
ἀστῶν θ’ ὑπὲρ τῶνδ’ ἅπτομαι φέρων
Λυδίαν μίτραν καναχηδὰ πεποικιλμέναν,
Δείνιος δισσῶν σταδίων
    καὶ πατρὸς Μέγα Νεμεαῖον ἄγαλμα.
        PIND. *N.* 8.13–16

As suppliant I clasp Aiakos' revered knees for my beloved city
and these citizens bearing
a Lydian band echoing and ornate
for Deinias' double stade
    and his father Megas a Nemean adornment.

In the absence of a deictic frame the space for explicit self-definition or claims to authority is limited. Identity and authority at the level of text operate in the interaction between content and historical moment, and it is much harder to detect such effects with confidence, since in most cases the song loses all identity when the song becomes circulating text and is removed from context. This is reflected in Alexandrian debates about taxonomy in the case of particular songs. When released into the Greek world, they have a value which is largely aesthetic. But there is usually more at work than aesthetics. In the original context the implied voice and with it the claim to identity and authority is heard. The narrative is itself an important constituent of identity. This narrative inclusivity is easily detected when it is firmly contextualized. A straightforward example can be seen in the paean of Isyllos of Epidauros, where we have a version of the birth of Asklepios. It marks itself out as the shared narrative of Epidauros because it presents the god's genealogy in a way which avoids any of the elements of wrongdoing on the part of Koronis which we find in Pindar *P.* 3 and elsewhere. But the localization of the myth is confirmed by the details which identify participants and audience explicitly as citizens of Epidauros. It is more elusive when we are offered unfettered narrative. Bacchylides 17 is a revealing text in this respect. It tells the story of a clash between Theseus and Minos on the voyage of the Athenian youths and maidens to Crete. Minos in this narrative is marked by the abuse of power, in which the harsh reality of his control over his prisoners is made worse by an element of hybris which induces him to assault one of the girls. His opponent Theseus is an inverse image of restraint and protection of the weak. The clash culminates with the vindication of Theseus' claim to be the son of Poseidon in a miraculous incident which makes the sea his natural element. The song is

undated and arguments for dating risk circularity but I am strongly persuaded by those[7] who would date the poem to the 470s and see in it a sort of charter for the Athenian-led confederacy after Salamis. All this would be pure speculation but for the minimalist contextualization at the close. The song in a very brief coda identifies its chorus (Kean youths) and location, significantly Delos:

ἠίθεοι δ᾽ ἐγγύθεν
νέοι **παιάνιξαν** ἐρατᾷ ὀπί.
Δάλιε, χοροῖσι Κη-
ΐων φρένα ἰανθεὶς
ὄπαζε θεόπομπον ἐσθλῶν τύχαν.
Bacch. 17.128–132

The youths nearby
sang a paian with lovely voice.
God of Delos, with mind charmed
by Kean dances
grant godsent share of blessings.

The myth is (among other things) a large inclusive gesture drawing in Athens, its Ionian allies assembled at Delos, and the collective mission, all focused on what was or would become its center. It may be significant here that the benison in this coda is so unspecific. It invokes blessing; it identifies source (the gods) and mechanism (the song) but not the recipient or recipients. The coda potentially invokes blessing for all the participants at Delos as well as specifically for the Keans through their chorus. The Kean voice in Bacchylides is muted. There is an intra-textual chorus in this poem, those who sing the paean inside the poem (line 129). This intra-textual chorus is Ionian.[8] And the hero of the song is Athenian. The implied inclusiveness of the singing voice here can be measured by comparison with Pindar's *Paean* 4, for another Kean chorus performing at Delos, which we will discuss later. The exclusively Keos-focused praise and explicit self-identification with island and people in Pindar's poem offers a striking contrast to the larger sense of identity implicitly generated by the narrative in B. 17. The fact that only the coda rescues

7 See most recently Fearn (2007) 252–255 (tentatively); Hadjimichael (2011) 39–40, 64.

8 Κυανόπρῳρα μὲν ναῦς μενέ-| κτυ[πον] **Θησέα** δὶς ἑπτ[ά] τ᾽ ἀγλαοὺς | ἄγουσα κούρους **Ἰαόνω**[ν]| Κρητικὸν τάμνε πέλαγος· "The dark prowed ship | bearing steadfast Theseus and the twice-seven | glorious Ionian youths | was cutting the Cretan sea." (Bacch. 17.1–4).

us from wild speculation underlines how easily narrative gestures of inclusion can be missed if stripped of context. It also lends support to the (necessarily speculative attempts) of scholars[9] to assign geographical locations to those of Bacchylides' so-called dithyrambs for which we have no external performance data or deictic frame. This narrative inclusiveness is regularly appropriated by the epinician in its tacit claim to represent the larger community rather than simply the sectional interests of the victor and his group.

As will be clear, distinction between diachronic and synchronic contextualization, though useful for taxonomy, is highly artificial. Narratives of the sort we have been considering exist on both axes; they have a synchronic role in constituting the present, which they do by establishing a shared past. The *pateres* of Corinna and the *progonoi* of Isyllos are collective, not family-specific: they resemble the *progonoi* in the Athenian *epitaphios logos*, whose affinity with cult song has been noted by D'Alessio.[10] The difference between the two axes identified above is one of articulation and focus rather than purpose.

I turn now to more overt modes of definition. A straightforward example of the way in which identity is constructed in cult song is offered by Isyllos. His inscribed paean opens with a gesture which formally separates speaker from group; the former is unspecified, the latter identified as the people of Epidauros:

> ἰεπαιᾶνα θεὸν ἀείσατε λαοί,
> ζαθέας ἐνναέται τᾶσδ' Ἐπιδαύρου.
>
> *IG* iv² 1, 128, 37–56, lines 1–2

> Sing people the god of the paian cry,
> inhabitants of this sacred land of Epidauros.

This element of implied or explicit separation seems to be a common opening gesture in public contexts. The speaker then implicitly merges with the group in the claim to a shared tradition and ancestry in lines 3–4:

> ὧδε γὰρ φάτις ἐνέπουσ' ἤλυθ' ἐς ἀκοὰς
> προγόνων ἁμετέρων, ὦ Φοῖβε Ἀπόλλων.

9 See, e.g., Jebb (1905) 234; Zimmermann (2008) 68–69, 98–99; Maehler (1997) 129, 211; Fearn (2007) 240–241; Hadjimichael (2011) 65–66.

10 D'Alessio (2009) 159–161.

For thus the account has come to our ears
from our ancestors, Phoibos Apollo.

There the first-person plural (προγόνων ἁμετέρων) hovers between a poetic plural for singular and a literal reference to all present which asserts the right to represent the *polis*. This inclusiveness recurs at the close after the narrative of the genealogy of Asklepios (lines 23–25):

ἱεπαιάν, ἱεπαιάν, χαῖρ{εν}[11] Ἀσκλα-
πιέ, τὰν σὰν Ἐπίδαυρον ματρόπολιν αὔ-
ξων, ἐναργῆ δ' ὑγίειαν ἐπιπέμποις
φρεσὶ καὶ σώμασιν ἁμοῖς· ἱεπαιάν, ἱεπαιάν.

Hail Paian, hail Paian, fare you well, Asklepios,
raising up your mothercity,
and may you send manifest health
to our minds and bodies. Hail Paian, hail Paian.

ματρόπολιν and ἁμοῖς between them in lines 23–25 embrace speaker and audience in a single kinship group as recipients of the god's favor. Again it is interesting to see the cult gestures mimicked in ritual moments in the victory ode, at *P*. 8.98–100, where the same ambiguity occurs in the reference to Aegina as mother:

Αἴγινα φίλα μᾶτερ, ἐλευθέρῳ στόλῳ
πόλιν τάνδε κόμιζε Δὶ καὶ κρέοντι σὺν Αἰακῷ
Πηλεῖ τε κἀγαθῷ Τελαμῶνι σύν τ' Ἀχιλλεῖ.

Aegina, dear mother, in course of freedom
bring safe this city with mighty Zeus and Aiakos
and Peleus and goodly Telamon and with Achilles.

It is left unclear whether this is the poet who has composed for the island for forty years or the chorus which is more profoundly implicated in the prayer for liberation and can more literally claim the island as mother.

The paean of Isyllos is not great poetry. But it does effectively illustrate in a nutshell the various tropes available in the articulation of the ritual voice.

11 χαῖρ' Wilamowitz, χαῖρεν inscr.

Much of what we find in the more ambitious lyric cult songs amounts to an elaboration of the gestures which we find in his poem. One of the most frequently studied uses of the first person in ritual moments is the *Fourth Paean* of Pindar. All the features we can detect in Isyllos are here but handled with a masterly skill. The simple inclusiveness of the ritual "we" is here developed in a way which both adds depth and substance to the representation of civic identity and by setting up themes to be developed in the myth allows the poem to achieve an impressive unity of design. As with Isyllos the relationship between singing voice and community is not static but dynamic. The poem opens with a request for peace for Keos (line 7 ἡ]συχίαν Κέῳ). The speaker (as far as we can see) goes unspecified but the third-person reference to Keos (not ἁμῖν) in the opening implicitly (but as with Isyllos) separates speaking voice from the beneficiary of the song. As the speaker's identity begins to take shape, the voice merges with the population. The absorption is handled differently, however. The simple "we" of Isyllos is replaced by a first-person singular which speaks for the chorus but beyond the chorus develops a shifting identity. We begin with a neat division between *polis* and population:

] Χάρισι· Κάρθαι-
  α μὲν ἐλα]χύνωτον στέρνον χθονός
  ]νιν Βαβυλῶνος ἀμείψομαι
  ]έχεται πεδίων

PIND. *Pae.* 4 = fr. 52d.13–16

… Charites. Karthaia
is a narrowbacked breast of land
but I will not] exchange it for [the wealth of the]
plains of Babylon.

But the effect of the distinction is to tie citizen and city by emphasizing the bond of loyalty which links them. This presentation of the speaking voice becomes more ambiguous in the lines which follow. In 21–24 ναίων strongly suggests the human inhabitants, as does παρέχων. The third person in ἄρο[υρ]α φέρει (25) again differentiates inhabitant from location. But ἄνιππός εἰμι is more ambiguous. It can mean "not riding,"[12] a reading suggested by the following

12 Cf. Hdt. 2.108.3: ἀπὸ γὰρ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου Αἴγυπτος, ἐοῦσα πᾶσα πεδιάς, ἄνιππος καὶ ἀναμάξευτος γέγονε· "From this point in time Egypt, though all of it plain, has become unfit for horses and unfit for wagons."

βουνομίας ἀδαέστερος, "I am unskilled in pasturing cattle," which points firmly toward the inhabitants; but after ἄρο[υρ]α φέρει it invites a reading "unfit for horses," a reading also tacitly suggested by the Homeric intertext.[13] This is an unusually bold, if understated, effect. The speaking voice while always being the singing chorus also becomes at intervals the typical inhabitant or the inhabitants as a collective and the island itself. The effect is not just aesthetic. The presentation of the contemporary population as modest in its ambitions, which is picked up in the treatment of Melampous in the mythic section, allows the song to give a depiction of *sophrosyne* (both mythical ancestor and people are content with a little and reject the desire for more) as an embedded aspect of Kean identity over time. It also presents an ideal of devotion to country and through the effective crystallization of the population into a single voice gives a powerful sense of unity of a sort otherwise encountered only in the tragic chorus. This is later picked up in Melampous' rejection of the divisions which come with wealth:

> ἐμοὶ δ' ὀλίγον δέδοται θά[μνου ,
>   οὐ πενθέων δ' ἔλαχον, ⟨οὐ⟩ στασίων.
>
> PIND. *Pae.* 4 = fr. 52d

> To me is granted a small stretch of thicket,
> but I have no share of grief, none of strife.

If we look back, we see that this aspect of the culture was prepared in the opening request for ἡ]συχίαν Κέῳ; not just blessings but very specifically the blessing of internal tranquility, ἡσυχία. In a world where socio-political tension was always a source of anxiety, this is a compelling presentation. But it has been suggested recently[14] that this image of harmony may not in fact be the case; there may have been tensions within Keos. So the image given by Pindar here may be as much a persuasive definition as a depiction of the reality on the ground. But as an exercise in lateral inclusiveness it is very finely judged. It is also well judged as an act of communication with the wider Greek world beyond the festival. In presenting Keos as an example of *sophrosyne*, Pindar makes it a moral exemplar. A recent study by Thomas Hubbard emphasizes the importance of the didactic dimension for the mobility of poetry within the Greek world and

---

13 *Od.* 4.601–608 (607: οὐ γάρ τις νήσων ἱππήλατος οὐδ' εὐλείμων).

14 D'Alessio (2009) 164 (economic tensions); Hadjimichael (2011) 38 (tensions in the period after the foundation of the Delian League).

its panhellenic reception.[15] The larger themes in this poem reach out beyond the moment of performance to bid for reperformance and with it the projection laterally in space and forward in time of the self-image of the island.

The ambiguities of voice which we find in *Paean* 4 recur in *Paean* 2. Again we begin with a gesture separating the speaking voice from the population:

> Ναΐδ]ος Θρονίας Ἄβδηρε χαλκοθώραξ
> Ποσ]ειδᾶνός τε παῖ,
> σέθ]εν Ἰάονι τόνδε λαῷ
> παι]ᾶνα [δι]ώξω
> Δηρηνὸν Ἀπόλλωνα πάρ τ' Ἀφρο[δίταν.
>
> PIND. *Pae.* 2 = fr. 52b.1–5

> Abderos corseleted in bronze,
> son of the naiad Thronia and Poseidon,
> from you for the Ionian folk
> I shall drive this paian
> to Apollo Derenos and Aphrodite.

The relationship between the unexpressed first person and the Ionian *laos* is initially left unspecified; in line 25 however the first person unemphatically but unambiguously merges with the people—ναίω.[16] This identity is continued in 29, where the notion of the city as mother is expanded into the rather grotesque image for the refoundation of Teos from Abdera, if that is what is meant.[17] This identity of the speaker as the collective voice of the citizens persists through the poem. It emerges at 39–40, where whatever the supplement we have a reference to a continuing (present indicative) struggle against enemy forces.[18] Amid a chiaroscuro narrative of troubles and successes past and present the speaker notes (57) that a man should honor his parents.[19] The formulation here is astute. The preceding lines have spoken generally of distant previous

15 Hubbard (2011) 350.

16 Pind. *Pae.* 2 = fr. 52b.24–26: ..]α τινα [τάνδε] ναίω | Θ[ρ]αϊκίαν γ[αῖ]αν ἀμπελό[εσ]σάν τε καί εὔκαρπον· "by some … I inhabit this Thracian land with its vines and rich in crops."

17 Pind. *Pae.* 2 = fr. 52b.28–31: νεόπολίς εἰμι· ματρὸς | δὲ ματέρ' ἐμᾶς ἔτεκον ἔμπαν | πολεμίῳ πυρὶ πλαγεῖ-| σαν. "I am a new city. But my mother's mother still I bore When she was struck down by war's fire." See most recently Rutherford (2001) 268–269.

18 Pind. *Pae.* 2 = fr. 52b.37–40: ἀλκαὶ δὲ τεῖχος ἀνδρῶν | ὕψιστον ἵσταται |]ρα· μάρναμαι μὰν | δᾴοις· "Our men's valor stands as the highest wall. … In truth I fight against enemies."

19 Pindar *Pae.* 2 = fr. 52b.54–58.

generations (τῶν πάλαι προθανόντων); these are then redesignated as parents (τοκεῦσιν). Though on the surface this means no more than that each man should honor his own parents, the implied equation τῶν πάλαι προθανόντων = τοκεῦσιν has the effect of emphasizing that dead and living belong to a single kinship group, a slippage prefigured by the parental metaphor in line 29. As with *Paean* 4, the text offers a constitutive statement which is designed to cast the population as a unified body. One further detail is worth noting. In line 29 the adjective *neopolis* used of the citizen would mean 'belonging to a young city'; but it may also suggest 'young city.' The adjective may come close to identifying speaker and city in a manner reminiscent of the paean for Keos.

Lutz Käppel saw this kind of collective definition through the first-person speaker as specific to the paean.[20] Given the paucity of evidence it is difficult to say with confidence how far this was replicated in other performance contexts. But we can say that it is not the only first-person stance available in the paean. There are other strategies available. The paean for Thebes begins with a variation on the openings we have seen so far. It plunges us *in medias res* with the urgent invocation to the sun:

> Ἀκτὶς ἀελίου, τί πολύσκοπε μήσεαι,
> ὦ μᾶτερ ὀμμάτων, ἄστρον ὑπέρτατον
> ἐν ἁμέρᾳ κλεπτόμενον; ⟨τί δ'⟩ ἔθηκας ἀμάχανον
> ἰσχύν ⟨τ'⟩ ἀνδράσι καὶ σοφίας ὁδόν,
> ἐπίσκοτον ἀτραπὸν ἐσσυμένα;
> ἐλαύνεις τι νεώτερον ἢ πάρος;
>
> PIND. *Pae.* 9 = fr. 52k.1–6

> Beam of the sun, what will you contrive,
> mother of eyes, highest star
> stolen in daylight? Why have you made powerless
> men's might and wisdom's road
> hastening on a darkened path?
> Do you bring some event unprecedented?.

It proceeds to turn this anxious enquiry into an intervention for the common good of the sort which opens the second and fourth paeans, though again with greater urgency:

20 Käppel (1992) 71.

ἀλλά σε πρὸς Διός, ἱπποσόα θοάς,
ἱκετεύω, ἀπήμονα
εἰς ὄλβον τινὰ τράποιο Θήβαις,
ὦ πότνια, πάγκοινον τέρας.
PIND. *Pae*. 9 = fr. 52k.7–10

But by Zeus, you, swift driver of horses,
I beg, to some painless
blessing for Thebes please turn,
mistress, this portent for all.

Here the singular voice is not collective, unlike the previous two paeans discussed, but typical. This is not the citizen body as a whole but a single concerned citizen voice:

ὀλοφύ⟨ρομαι οὐ⟩δέν, ὅ τι πάντων μέτα πείσομαι.
PIND. *Pae*. 9 = fr. 52k.21

I lament nothing that I shall suffer together with all.

Despite the difference in focus, however, the effect is again to speak for all by offering a representative view. And once more the voice derives its authority in part from its loyalty to the common wellbeing in face of menace, this time superhuman.

In the poems we have seen so far self-definition by the group appears to be a major aspect of the performance and this determines the voice which is generated and the kind of authority which is created. But the differences between the two poems are as revealing as the similarities. The paean for Abdera was evidently performed at a festival at Abdera in honor of the eponymous hero; honorand, public, and place are all firmly indicated. The paean for the Keans was performed as part of a *theoria* at an Ionian festival on Delos (*Pae*. 4.11–13).[21] These poems for different reasons place a high premium on collective self-representation. The Kean paean projects a geographical, ethical, and perhaps political identity into the Ionian *panegyris* at Delos. The Abderite paean involves an act of self-representation by and to the collective. Here the defining process has additional urgency against an explicit background of what looks like acknowledged discord in the past and in the face of an external threat.

21 For the role of *theoria* in Greek culture see in general Rutherford 2013.

If performative context is a defining feature of voice, context is to be understood as a shifting combination of location, audience, and moment. This is suggested by the way the situation changes when we look at the opening of Pindar fr. 52s (1–5). This is again classified as a paean in modern editions; the classification has been contested but certainly the substantial remains of the title point at least to a cult song. And it looks like a song for a local festival for Elektryon, performed in the precinct of the Dioskouroi at Argos. The voice projected at the opening of the song is however quite different from that in the local celebration at Abdera.

ἐν Τυν]δαριδᾶν ἱερῷ
τεμέ]νει πεφυτευμένον ἄ[λσος
ἀνδ]ρὶ σοφῷ παρέχει μέλος [
....]. ν' ἀμφὶ πόλιν φλεγε[
....]ν ὕμνων σέλας ἐξ ἀκαμαν[το ...

PIND. *Pae.* 18 = fr. 52s.1–5

In the sacred precinct of the Tyndarids
the grove there planted
provides song for a man of wisdom
... about the city blazes
... the light of songs from untiring ...

There is no explicit poetic *ego* here; nothing is said which must exclude the chorus. But ἀνδ]ρὶ σοφῷ παρέχει μέλος, a variation on what in the victory ode has been called the *eumachania*[22] theme, suggests the role of the poet. In the absence of explicit statement, we cannot identify this unambiguously as an example of the voice of the poet in the mouth of the chorus in the manner familiar from the victory ode. And we cannot trace the development of the voice in the rest of the poem. What is clear is that authority here is poetic, not socio-political; there is no emphasis on group membership as the basis for speech. This is true whether we recognize a hint at the poet's voice or a chorus acknowledging its poet in the manner of Alcman.[23] An interesting parallel is offered by the so-called Dithyramb 19 of Bacchylides. There we have a much more elaborate opening which uses the same "wealth of

22 See especially Pindar *P.*9.90–92, *I.*4.1–3, *I.*5.1–15, *N.*11.1–19. The motif is not of course specifically epinician; it is found already in early hymn—*H.Hom.Ap.*19.

23 Alcman *PMGF* 39.

inspiration" motif and expands the simple ἀνδρὶ σοφῷ of Pindar to a statement of poetic inspiration:

Πάρεστι μυρία κέλευ-
θος ἀμβροσίων μελέων,
ὃς ἂν παρὰ Πιερίδων
λάχησι δῶρα Μουσᾶν,
ἰοβλέφαροί τε κ⟨όρ⟩αι
φερεστέφανοι Χάριτες
βάλωσιν ἀμφὶ τιμὰν
ὕμνοισιν· ὕφαινέ νυν ἐν
ταῖς πολυηράτοις τι καινὸν
ὀλβίαις Ἀθάναις,
εὐαίνετε Κηΐα μέριμνα.
πρέπει σε φερτάταν ἴμεν
ὁδὸν παρὰ Καλλιόπας
λαχοῖσαν ἔξοχον γέρας
Bacch. 19.1–14

There are to hand countless paths
of immortal songs
for any who is granted
gifts from the Pierian Muses
and the dark glanced maidens,
the Charites with their crowns
cast honour upon
his songs. Weave now
in lovely blessed Athens something new,
famed skill of Keos.
Your task is to take the best
road from Kalliope,
who have been granted the highest prize.

And the third person is replaced by a self-address which identifies the speaking voice as that of a poet from Keos, the nearest a panhellenic choral poet can come to naming himself—unlike monodists, who are free to give their personal name. The location is identified as Athens.

It is much easier in the second of these examples to account for the difference between the speaking voice and the persona carefully adopted in Pindar's *Paeans* 2, 4, and 9. Unlike tragedy, which was an exclusively Athenian product

in authorship, financing, and performance, festival choral songs at Athens were almost invariably supplied by foreigners. So the foreign poet was an explicit and prominent presence. And the competition was between tribes, which meant that any larger Athenian civic identity was promoted by the context as a whole rather than any one sung component. At least two of these festivals promoted themselves as international events, the (greater) Panathenaia and the Dionysia. This significantly altered the dynamics of self-presentation, since the ability to attract, support, and pay for foreign talent becomes a positive statement of the city's financial and cultural standing; this in turn allowed further room for an emphatic foreign voice. The same phenomenon can be seen in Pindar's dithyramb for Athens (fr. 75). This explanation will not work for the festival of Elektryon (or his sons)[24] at Argos, but it may be that there are other factors which encourage an audible poetic voice. The opening of Pindar *Pae.* 18 reads (as Rutherford notes[25]) like an epinician, i.e. like a song of praise, and it may be that the externality of poetic voice brings with it an element of objectivity useful in the praise of a heroic recipient whose significance in the larger Greek world was limited. This interplay between local and panhellenic may explain the prominence of the poet in Pindar's dithyramb for the Thebans:

ἐμὲ δ' ἐξαίρετο[ν
κάρυκα σοφῶν ἐπέων
Μοῖσ' ἀνέστασ' Ἑλλάδι κα[λ]λ̣[ιχόρῳ
PIND. fr. 70b.23–25

Me the Muse appointed
as chosen herald of wise verses
for Greece with its beautiful dances.

The context, a Theban festival, is one which might have generated a singing voice which was either typical or compendiary, like the positions adopted in other local paeans we have seen. Instead we have a pronounced emphasis on the poetic voice as a panhellenic presence. It may be that the key factor here is the fact that Thebes has a poet of panhellenic status. Though the genre is different, the same interplay between local and panhellenic can be seen at work in the first *Isthmian*, where Pindar sets his composition for a Theban victor in the balance against a competing composition for Delos (P. *Isthm.* 1.1–10).

24 D'Alessio (1997) 41; detailed discussion in Prodi (2014) 307–311.
25 Rutherford (2001) 425.

What all this suggests (unsurprisingly) is that the dynamics of voice are negotiable and respond, like other aspects of the content of the song, to a number of factors, alone or in combination. Inclusivity is not an inevitable aspect of deictic voice in cult contexts. The Athenian example, because it bridges the local/panhellenic divide, neatly takes us to another set of contexts, the panhellenic festivals. It has long been observed that Pindar's *Sixth Paean*, composed for a festival at Delphi, uses the speaking voice in a very different way from his paeans for Abdera and Keos. As with Bacchylides' poem for Athens, the opening presents us with a voice that can only be that of the poet. Together with the proud persona familiar from the victory odes we also find the playfulness which we find for instance at the opening of *Nemean* 3. Where that poem opens with a contrived urgency generated by the lateness of his song, here the poet comes because ostensibly there was a need for performance and no song to sing:

Πρὸς Ὀλυμπίου Διός σε, χρυσέα
    κλυτόμαντι Πυθοῖ,
λίσσομαι Χαρίτεσ-
    σίν τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτᾳ,
ἐν ζαθέῳ με δέξαι χρόνῳ
ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν·
ὕδατι γὰρ ἐπὶ χαλκοπύλῳ
    ψόφον ἀϊὼν Κασταλίας
ὀρφανὸν ἀνδρῶν χορεύσιος ἦλθον
ἔταις ἀμαχανίαν ἀ[λ]έξων
    τεοῖσιν ἐμαῖς τε τιμ[α]ῖς·

PIND. *Pae.* 6 = fr. 52f.1–11

By Olympian Zeus, golden Pytho famed for prophecy,
I beg you with the Charites and Aphrodite,
receive me at the sacred time,
the tuneful spokesman of the Pierides.
For at the water with its gates of bronze
    hearing Kastalia's sound
bereft of men's dance I have come
averting helplessness from your kin and my honors.

The song advertises itself as composed for the Delphians. But the occasion is explicitly one for the whole of Greece.[26] This is a panhellenic song at a

26 Vv: 62–63 θύεται γὰρ ἀγλαᾶς ὑπὲρ Πανελλάδος "Sacrifice is offered for all of Greece."

panhellenic festival. It represents no specific Delphian interests. The closing section, which turns to Aegina, leaves open the possibility that the costs were met by Aegina. Certainly Aegina is given a striking prominence and evidently had a close connection with the festival.[27] But whatever the link with Aegina, this song (unlike Pindar's Kean paean for Delos) was not meant to be associated with a single participating state. The authority in this case, as in Bacchylides 19, is poetic; it is also based on Pindar's own relationship with Delphi, in what looks like a variation on the motifs of *philia*, *xenia*, and *syngeneia* which often underpin the poetic authority in the victory odes. In itself, the opening of a song in honor of a divinity with a separation of the speaking voice from the collective seems to be normal. But in this case, unlike the paeans for Keos and Abdera, there is no shift in poetic voice; as Mary Lefkowitz observed long ago,[28] the poetic voice seems to remain constant, in the sense that nothing is said to point to another speaker, and the positioning of the voice elsewhere in the song is either indeterminate (as εὐνάξομεν 128) or (as in the introduction to the myth) quasi-rhapsodic. The voice of the panhellenic poet is in a case such as this a useful means of underlining the international nature of the occasion. This may also apply to the song (of uncertain genre) composed for Dodone (fr.* 59), where the arrival motif (κατεβα[4) suggests an outsider as at the beginning of *Pae.* 6, while the traces may suggest a poetic statement of a sort similar to that found in that poem.[29]

It is worth adding, however, that what we are observing is a trend, not a rule. There are always alternatives available to the travelling poet. The paean of Aristonoos (*Fouilles de Delphes* 2.191, *CA* 162–164) avoids entirely this kind of explicit self-positioning by the poet. Aristonoos instead opts for a subtle and ambiguous voice. Much of the poem is a second-person narrative visibly influenced by the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. The final stanza rounds off the poem with a brief prayer for divine favor (lines 41–48):

ἀλλ' ὦ Παρνασσοῦ γυάλων
εὐδρόσοισι Κασταλίας
νασμοῖς σὸν δέμας ἐξαβρύ-
νων, ἰὴ ἰὲ Παιάν,

27 Recent discussion in Rutherford (2001) 324–338 (who also discusses the complex textual problems of the final triad); Kowalzig (2007) 184–223.

28 Lefkowitz (1991) 23.

29 Pind. Fr. *59.8–10:]ς ἁμετέρας ἀπ[ο | φόρμι]γγι κοινωσ]ν πολυώνυμον· "... from our [mind?] ... join with the lyre ... famous."

χαρεὶς ὕμνοις ἡμετέροις,
ὄλβον ἐξ ὁσίων διδοὺς
ἀεὶ καὶ σώιζων ἐφέποις
ἡμᾶς, ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν.

But you who in the hollows of Parnassos
in the pleasant streams
of Kastalia soften your body,
hail, hail Paian,
Pleased with our song
giving blessing for righteousness
and keeping safe always may you be
with us, o hail Paian.

The stanza twice uses the first-person plural with a lack of specificity which allows it to be heard in several ways. The first, ἡμετέροις ὕμνοις, could be plural for singular, referring to the composer. It could equally refer to the performing voice. Or it could refer to the assembled worshippers. The second, σῴζων ἐφέποις ἡμᾶς, is equally unspecific; in context it points most naturally to those gathered but the rhapsodic antecedents allow it also to be heard as an authorial and/or performer voice. This ambiguous first person authorizing the speaker both as representative of the group and as creator of pleasing song is one of the most elegant instances of voice in cult song which we have. What is notably lacking is the sense of poetic identity which we find in Pindar's Delphic paean.[30] This is pointed up by the inscription to which the song is appended, which proclaims the privileges accorded to Aristonoos at Delphi for his compositions:

Δελφοὶ ἔδωκαν Ἀριστονό[ωι, ἐπεὶ] τοὺς ὕμνους τοῖς θεοῖς ἐπο[ίησεν], αὐτῶι καὶ ἐκγόνοις, προξ[ενίαν], εὐεργεσίαν, προμαντεῖαν, πρ[οεδρίαν], προδικίαν, ἀσυλίαν πολέμου [καὶ εἰ]ρήνης, ἀτέλειαν πάντων, καὶ ἐπιτι[μὰ]ν καθάπερ Δελφοῖς, ἄρχοντος [Δα]μοχάρεος, βουλευόντων[Ἀ]ντάνδρου, Ἐρασίππου, Εὐαρχίδα.

The Delphians granted Aristonoos, since he composed the hymns for the gods, for himself and his descendants the role of representative, the status of benefactor, right of first consultation, privileged seating, priority

30 See now on this Lozynsky (2014) 84, and for the peritext more generally 179–180, 186, 229–233.

> adjudication, protection from seizure in war and peace, release from all dues and rights as the Delphians in the archonship of Damochares, when the councillors were Antandros, Erasippos, Euarchidas.

Pindar in contrast frames his song with his honors:

> ὕδατι γὰρ ἐπὶ χαλκοπύλῳ
> ψόφον ἀΐων Κασταλίας
> ὀρφανὸν ἀνδρῶν χορεύσιος ἦλθον
> ἔταις ἀμαχανίαν ἀ[λ]έξων
> τεοῖσιν ἐμαῖς τε τιμ[α]ῖς·
> PIND. *Pae.* 6 = fr. 52f.7–11

> For at the water with its gates of bronze
> hearing Kastalia's sound
> bereft of men's dance I have come
> averting helplessness from your kin and my honours.

The Delphic hymn to Hestia goes a step further, in that the speaking voice has no bardic element; it explicitly merges all present in the act of celebration in dance expressed in the climactic final word (*Fouilles de Delphes* 2.192, *CA* 164–165):

> δίδου δ’ ἀμοιβὰς
> ἐξ ὁσίων πολὺν ἡμᾶς
> ὄλβον ἔχοντας ἀεὶ λιπαρόθρονον
> ἀμφὶ σὰν θυμέλαν χορεύειν.

> Grant in exchange
> for righteousness that we
> with sleek blessing always
> dance about your hearth.

Here we need to factor in another two elements, period and fashion. Isyllos' paean belongs to the late fourth century. Aristonoos' compositions belong to the fourth century. Fantuzzi has argued recently for the merits of the inscribed cult songs of this period.[31] Certainly the fact of inscription and the honors

31 Fantuzzi (2010); see esp. 195–196.

granted to Aristonoos suggest that neither the poet nor the civic authorities see these as texts of low quality. So we can rule out modesty. By this time the age of the travelling panhellenic lyric poets is at an end, and popular taste may be less receptive to the grandiloquent gestures and buccaneering manner which characterized the archaic lyric grand masters. It was for Callimachus and Theocritus to try to revive the archaic poetic voice.

The final aspect of voice to be considered is gender. Here we can be reasonably brief because so much has been written. But the dynamics of female voice in civic song are simultaneously the most developed and the most difficult to grasp. They are also the most fascinating. All the texts we have been considering are engaging in a kind of rhetoric designed to create relationships. But it is especially important to be aware of the rhetoric which is in play when women sing.

There is a striking paradox at the heart of the construction of the young female in civic contexts. Recurrent imagery across a range of genres presents the young female as a potential source of disruption to be tamed. But we know that the female voice—or rather the virgin female voice—is in civic contexts authoritative. The image of collective female song is a recurrent one in lyric texts, regularly offered as parallel implicit or explicit for male civic song.[32] So there is theoretically no more need for authorization than in the case of men. But there is a difference. In most of the cases studied, as with Isyllos, the representativeness is mediated through a shifting presentation which locates the speaking voice intermittently inside and outside the group. The inescapable facts of syntax and accidence mean that the female voice advertises itself as a subset of the *polis* in any poetic statement, and a young and (otherwise) disempowered subset. Linguistically, therefore conceptually and experientially, the speaker is inescapably a marked category. Hence, perhaps, the difference in the way the speaking voice relates to the collective. In Alcman fr. 3 his girls like other cult singers open with a gesture which distinguishes them from the larger group:

[Ὀλ]υμπιάδες περί με φρένας
[ ]ς ἀοιδας
[ ]ω δ' ἀκούσαι
[ ]ας ὀπός
[ ]. .ρα καλὸν ὑμνιοισᾶν μέλος
[ ].οι
[ὕπνον ἀ]πὸ γλεφάρων σκεδ[α]σεῖ γλυκύν

32 Good discussion in Power (2000).

[ ]ς δέ μ' ἄγει πεδ' ἀγῶν' ἴμεν
[ἆχι μά]λιστα κόμ[αν ξ]ανθὰν τινάξω·

—

[ ].σχ[ἁπ]αλοὶ πόδες

ALCMAN fr. 3

... the Olympian [Muses] ... my mind
... song
... to hear
. . . . voice
... as they sing a fine song
...
Will scatter sweet sleep from my eyelids
... and leads me to go to the throng
where I shall vigorously shake my fair hair
... supple feet

But unlike the male choruses of the paean their first person never becomes explicitly representative. The chorus of Alcman achieves a *polis* voice, when it does, through the inclusive mythic narrative and gnomic statements rather than through deictic elements. So the process of creating authority to speak for the whole is more demanding. It is an observable (and long observed) fact that the self-representation of the speaker is much more extensive in the maiden-song than in the paean. In Pindar's paeans for Keos and Abdera the overt self-identification is both brief and highly localized (usually early) within the text. In the maiden-song it is a sustained effect throughout the composition. There is, at least in the surviving examples, a pronounced element of apologia. In Alcman this is registered in self-deprecation, an inherently attractive characteristic in a society which limits the power of women; it is a gesture which by aligning the speakers with idealized gender stereotypes gives them a moral weight which enhances their authority. This is more developed in Pindar, whose females explicitly eschew any kind of comment which might be unsuitable for their status.[33] They then proceed (as D'Alessio observed some time ago[34]) to make exactly the same kind of statements which we find in the male choruses of Pindar's epinicians, commenting on political issues and

---

33 E.g., Pind. fr. 94b.31–35: πολ]λὰ μὲν [τ]ὰ πάροιθ[| δαιδάλλοισ' ἔπεσιν, τὰ δ' a[| Ζεὺς οἶδ', ἐμὲ δὲ πρέπει | παρθενήϊα μὲν φρονεῖν | γλώσσᾳ τε λέγεσθαι· "Many things of yore as I adorn them with verses, the others ... Zeus knows, but my duty is to think maiden thoughts and speak them with my tongue."

34 D'Alessio (1994) 118–120.

civic service. The statements made could as easily be made by a male chorus (epinician or civic) and several are.[35] As with some of the other ploys we have seen in the cult songs already discussed, we have here positioning statements of a kind common in the victory odes, in the present case given a female dress. In the same way Alcman's self-deprecating girls comment on large issues of piety, moderation and hybris, as readily as a male chorus would. This includes (evidently) questions of sexual propriety. There is in practice no more limit on the female chorus than on the male, whatever restraints which might be imposed on virgin speech outside the chorus and outside the festival. But the claim to authority needs more careful management. The self-deprecation is part of this management, in that the explicit alignment with stereotype creates a moral authority which can be used to sustain larger ethical and socio-political statements.

This however does not fully explain the exquisite effects achieved in the *partheneion*. None of the songs we have seen suggests that the persona adopted is inevitable. Aesthetically the presentation of the female should be seen as much as an opportunity as a challenge. The comparative rarity of having females on display (unlike the many opportunities for males to perform cult songs both locally and at *theoriai*) and the potential frisson of having marriageable girls in public space offer an opportunity for poets (or at least some poets) to create more complex effects. One is coquettishness, registered in an innocent flirtatiousness, certainly in Alcman, where the girls' negative comments on their appearance as well as elevating their leaders by comparison also invite the audience to think the reverse. In the case of Pindar the sustained engagement with gender gives a fertile tension between authority and timidity.

It is revealing here to compare the female voice in Alcman and Pindar with the situation in Corinna. *PMG* 655 is inexplicit about its mode of performance, at least in what survives:

> ἐπί με Τερψιχόρα [
> καλὰ ϝεροῖ' ἀισομ[έναν
> Ταναγρίδεσσι λε[υκοπέπλυς
> μέγα δ' ἐμῆς γέγ[αθε πόλις
> λιγοθροκω[τί]λυ[ς ἐνοπῆς.
> ὅττι γὰρ μεγαλ.[
> ψευδ[.]σ.[.]αδομε[

35 With fr. 94b.35–49 cf., e.g., *O*.4.2–3, *O*.6.20–21, *P*.4.66, *I*.4.7–9. For the vicissitude motif in lines 62–65 cf., e.g., *P*.5.10–11, *I*.1.35–40, *Pae*.2.54–56, fr. 94a.8–13.

.[.]. .ω γῆαν εὐρού[χορον
λόγια δ' ἐπ πατέρω[ν
κοσμείσασα Ϝιδιο[
παρθ[έ]νυσι κατα[
πο]λλὰ μὲν Καφ[ισὸν ἰών-
γ' ἀρχ]αγὸν κόσμ[εισα λόγυ]ς ...

Terpsichora set me ...
To sing lovely songs
to the white-robed women of Tanagra
and my city rejoices deeply
at the shrill-cosseting voices.
For whatever great ...
false ...
... earth with its broad dancng grounds
adorning tales from our fathers' time
my own ...
for the maidens ...
Often adorning Kephisos
the leader with words I ...

The only firm reference to a chorus is in the adjective εὐρυχόρου, which says nothing about the actual performance. The first-person singular in line 4 (ἐμῆς = ἐμαῖς) could be a choral singular or it could be authorial, which again is theoretically consistent with choral performance. It could equally signal a solo performer, authorial, or other. The same applies to the other identity markers: ἀισομ[εναν?, κοσμείσασα, κόσμ[εισα, all of which are compatible with solo or choral performance. But though we may not identify the speaker, we can reconstruct elements of the context. This looks like public poetry. Ταναγρίδεσσι λευκοπέπλυς is unlikely to be an instrumental dative; parallels such as *O.* 6.86 (ἀνδράσιν αἰχματαῖσι πλέκων ποικίλον ὕμνον) suggest that we have hear an audience marker. On this basis παρθένυσι too in line 11 is likely to designate the receiving audience. But the ethnikon suggests that this is a women's gathering, not a small group of the sort conjectured for Sappho. What we have then appears to be an exclusively female context: a female voice (singular or plural) addresses a female gathering. This may explain the minimal presence of the rhetoric of power. There is none of the elaborate coquettishness which we find in Pindar and Alcman, where there is a persistent if contrived rhetoric of apologia for speaking in public space. How far this contrast can be extended to provide an account of Corinna and Boiotia and female perfor-

mances more generally in Greece is quite uncertain. But what we have suggests an approach to context not unlike that of Aristophanes' females at the Thesmophoria:

> ὅμως δ' ἐν ἀλλήλαισι χρὴ δοῦναι λόγον·
> αὐταὶ γάρ ἐσμεν, κοὐδεμί' ἐκφορὰ λόγου.
>
> ARIST. *Thesm.* 471–472

> Still we must discuss among ourselves.
> We're alone and our words will not be reported outside.

No female apologia is offered in female space.

If we look again at the texts surveyed, we can see some constants. There is a preference (anything but absolute) for the first-person singular, creating a unitary persona. There is usually a slippage in the relationship between the speaking voice and the community. Deictic features tend to present the speaker as an unidentified intermediary between the group and the divine addressee before the speaker is absorbed into the group. There is however considerable variety in the way the speaker presents himself as representative; sometimes we seem to have a kind of collective voice, sometimes a typical individual. The factors generating the particular form with this diversity are as likely to be aesthetic as geographical, social or political. The *polis* has commissioned, presumably at no small cost, a poet with an international reputation. What is wanted is not just a song which will effect good communication between the polis and its gods and heroes (important as that is) but also a song which will distinguish the moment and either by lingering in the memory to pass by word of mouth or by entering the oral songbook add luster to the polis. The finest aesthetic effects are achieved with the maiden choruses. Though these *are* representative, in that they speak for the polis, they effect this status by a more complex mixture of tones than is either required of or available to the male chorus.

Bibliography

D'Alessio, G. 1994. "First person problems in Pindar." *BICS* 39: 117–139.

D'Alessio, G. 1997. "Pindar's *Prosodia* and the Classification of Pindaric Papyrus Fragments." ZPE 118: 23–60.

D'Alessio, G. 2009. "Defining Local Identities in Greek Lyric Poetry." In *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*, ed. R. Hunter and I. Rutherford, 137–167. Cambridge.

Fantuzzi, M. 2010. "Sung Poetry: The Case of Inscribed Paeans." In *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, ed. J.J. Clauss and M. Cuypers, 181–196. Malden.

Fearn, D. 2007. *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*. Oxford.

Henrichs, A. 1996. "Dancing in Athens, Dancing on Delos: Some Patterns of Choral Projection in Euripides." *Philologus* 142: 48–62.

Hubbard, T. 2011. "The Dissemination of Pindar's Non-Epinician Choral Lyric." In *Archaic and Classical Choral Song*, ed. L. Athanassaki and E. Bowie, 247–267. Berlin.

Jebb, R. 1905. *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments*. Cambridge.

Kowalzig, B. 2007. *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford.

Lekowitz, M.R. 1991. *First Person Fictions: Pindars's Poetic 'I'*. Oxford.

Lozynsky, Y. 2014. *Ancient Greek Cult Hymns: Poets, Performers and Ritual*. Diss. Toronto.

Maehler, H. 1997. *Die Lieder des Bakchylides 2: die Dithyramben und Fragmente*. Leiden.

Power, T. 2000. "The 'Parthenoi' of Bacchylides 13." *HSCP* 100: 67–81.

Prodi, E. 2014. *Pindar's* Prosodia. Diss. Oxford.

Pulleyn, S. 1998. *Prayer in Greek Religion*. Oxford.

Rutherford, I.C. 2001. *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford.

Rutherford, I.C. 2013. *State Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece: A Study of Theoria and Theoroi*. Cambridge.

Zimmermann, B. 2008. *Dithyrambos. Geschichte einer Gattung*, 2nd ed. Berlin.

CHAPTER 3

Crooked Competition: The Performance and Poetics of *Skolia*

Richard P. Martin

> "The products of communal composition among us are trivial and ephemeral, and we fail to observe them, or, at all events, we seldom think of associating them with literature. We have come to associate "authorship" with something quite different from the singing and dancing throng."
>
> GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE, introduction to *English and Scottish Popular Ballads, edited from the collection of Francis James Child* (1904)[1]

Gradually, variously, reluctantly, and incompletely, major Hellenists of the 20th century came to realize that ancient Greek poetry is essentially folk literature. From tragedy and comedy, as treated by Harrison, Murray, and Cornford, to epic and hymns in the analyses of Parry, Lord, and Notopoulos, the compositions so securely attached to authors by readers and critics of preceding generations were pried from their fundamentalist foundations and set free from the tyranny of the solitary writer. Paradoxically, this rupture did not end up signaling an act of liberation, in the views of many. For years after *The Singer of Tales* (indeed, to the present day), scholars strove to rescue "Homer" from the embarrassing position in which (so they imagined) the demonstration of the all-permeating nature of oral-formulaic technique had trapped "him." Appeal was made to the "personality" of "Hesiod," as if this would keep "him" from the ignominy of being merely a genre-induced *persona*. Even Jane Ellen Harrison, having detailed in *Themis* the recurrent "ritual form" of theophany within half of the surviving

1 Edited by Helen Child Sargent and G.L. Kittredge (Boston: Houghton Mifflin). On the folklore tradition established by Child at Harvard and its connection to the later work there of Parry and Lord, see Bynum (1974). Ives (1997), analyzing the interaction of individual and tradition in 20th century ballad-making, gives a good sketch of the history of "communal composition."

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_005

plays of Euripides, sees the deep-roots of tragedy as a drag on the individual talent—or almost, a drug: “If this were free and original composition the monotony would be intolerable and incomprehensible: we can understand it only when we realize that the poet is working under the spell of a set traditional form.”[2]

Questions of authorship thus intersect inevitably not only with authority but also with aesthetic judgment. The common yet misleading association of anonymity with “orality” and authorship with “literacy,” and the former, furthermore, with primitivism or conventionality, serves to mask deeper anxieties about value and individual effort—probably exacerbated by meritocracies like the academies that frame our reading of ancient texts.[3] How can a poem in any way excel if it represents the product of “communal composition”—either diachronically, as the fruit of generations of playwrights reproducing what is ultimately a “ritual” form, or synchronically, as the result of sociopoetic processes deeply suspected and undervalued by exponents of Romantic and Modernist aesthetics?[4]

The perceived decline in authority when one loses the “author” is inversely proportional to the amount of power vested in the “folk” during any given period. Fifty years ago, the notion of a poetics of-and-for the “group” carried with it (at least in the Anglo-American discourse about Hellenism) a whiff of socialism—something permitted an avowed Marxist like George Derwent Thomson, but tastefully avoided by mainstream Classicists (for whom New Criticism effectively banished the problem).[5] Today when the name Anonymous, proudly adopted by hackers, strikes fear into the techno-corporate world while faceless users of social media create and break reputations, the “throng” —whether or not singing and dancing—has returned. It is within this framework—a new awareness of the powerful interplay among authors and “anonymous” authorities, along with an appreciation of aesthetic value as culture-bound and group-specific—that I would like to re-visit a Greek poetic form hitherto marginalized, apparently a “trivial and ephemeral” production that is actually, as I shall argue, at the heart of social life.

---

2 Harrison (1927) 352.

3 For a good recent appraisal of the equation of anonymous with “oral” and its consequences, with evidence from Old English poetics, see Bredehoft (2009) 1–38.

4 Of course, joint composition, pre-publication circulation of texts, automatic writing, chaining, and other forms of shared poetic enterprise are far from unknown in high literary periods, from Wordsworth through Eliot and Pound.

5 See Thomson (1945); for the roots of his socialist perspective on Homeric tradition, see Martin (2007).

As the handbooks would have it, *skolia* are "crooked" or "zig-zag" compositions, short songs associated with the symposium. Our main corpus of 25 songs is preserved by the work of Athenaeus from the late 2nd century CE (694c–695f), but the poems themselves most likely date to the 6th and 5th centuries BCE. The handbooks, as usual, build on ancient foundations, but in this case, those are rather shaky. Since antiquity there has been debate about what the word *skolia* signifies. Dicaearchus, the pupil of Aristotle, associated the word "crooked" with the practical details of performing this type of song. As we can see in a passage from the Suda, the Peripatetic scholar connected the term *skolion* with the random, non-linear *taxis* or order of those who sang the songs:

> **Suda s.v.** Σκολιόν: ἡ παροίνιος ᾠδή. ὡς μὲν **Δικαίαρχος** ἐν τῷ *Περὶ μουσικῶν ἀγώνων*, ὅτι τρία γένη ἦν ᾠδῶν: τὸ μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων ᾀδόμενον καθ' ἕνα ἑξῆς: τὸ δ' ὑπὸ τῶν συνετωτάτων, **ὡς ἔτυχε, τῇ τάξει: ὃ δὴ καλεῖσθαι διὰ τὴν τάξιν σκολιόν.** ὡς δ' **Ἀριστόξενος** καὶ **Φύλλις ὁ μουσικός**, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς γάμοις περὶ μίαν τράπεζαν πολλὰς κλίνας τιθέντες, παρὰ μέρος ἑξῆς μυρρίνας ἔχοντες **ᾖδον γνώμας καὶ ἐρωτικὰ σύντονα. ἡ δὲ περίοδος σκολιὰ ἐγίνετο**, διὰ τὴν θέσιν τῶν κλινῶν.
>
> A song drunk with wine. **Dicaearchus** in the [treatise] *On Musical Contests* says that there are three genres of songs: one kind sung by everyone one by one, sequentially; another sung by the most talented, **as it happens, in order, which was called crooked (σκολιόν) due to its order** [sc. **of singers**]. But **Aristoxenos** and **Phyllis the musician** [say] that in weddings they positioned many couches around a single table, and holding myrtle branches one after the other in turn they **used to sing their sentiments and erotic harmonies. The round [of singing] was crooked**, due to the placement of the couches.
>
> tr. ROSS SCAIFE

The *Suda* also tells us that Aristoxenus, the fellow-pupil and friend of Dicaearchus, and Phyllis, a musical expert, derived the name *skolion* from the positioning of guests at wedding feasts. While taking note of this precious and precise bit of testimony relating to the social pragmatics of performance, I would like to offer in this chapter a new explanation for the term *skolion* and follow up on some of the consequences of my proposal, especially those related to the idea of an "author."

Understanding the meaning and performance of *skolia* is complicated by the dual categories of extant data. We have to take into account, alongside the set of short verses in Athenaeus, a number of other poems, of which we have some knowledge—either through quotations or references—that are

also named *skolia* by various ancient sources. We have reference, for example, to verses that are attributed to at least a dozen different poets, including Pindar, Corinna, Terpander, Sappho, Alcaeus, and even Aristotle. As happens often, there are gaps in the attention paid to various categories. In contrast to the work of "canonical" Greek lyric poets, the anonymous *skolia* have not received much critical regard. The first full-scale edition with commentary is that of Fabbro (1995). And the *skolia* attributed to particular poets are always overshadowed by the more familiar compositions by those same poets in other genres. A second goal in this chapter will therefore be to articulate what characteristic unites these "professional" *skolia* by named "authors" with the anonymous examples preserved by Athenaeus or by other ancient traditions.

I should note at this point that there is one important recent work devoted entirely to *skolia* that does in fact try to unite the various categories. Greg Jones, who completed the dissertation in question at Johns Hopkins, comes to a conclusion that is quite the opposite to my own, especially with regard to the question of whether *skolia* are an identifiable genre. I shall offer a summary later in this chapter. For now, let me say that his work is particularly valuable in gathering almost all the testimonia, for both "professional" and anonymous *skolia*. Jones' work is focused on Greek without reference to comparative material. I shall suggest, by contrast, that especially in the case of *skolia* it is crucial to think outside the box in which we are confined by the ancient sources. Once we place them in the appropriate broader socio-poetic framework *skolia* can give us more insight than has previously been realized into the poetic "ecology" of ancient Greece. Further study can enable us to rewrite a portion of Greek literary history and to question the operation of the genre system, as it might have existed in the classical period.

One of the key aspects of these compositions that has received critical attention is their use in a competitive environment. They display, in miniature form, the agonistic spirit elsewhere seen in the great games and in the *mousikoi agônes* of Delphi, Athens, and other communities. Derek Collins has written at length about the competitive technique of "capping" or improvised verse-completion and sequencing. He views "capping" as the link among the art of the Homeric rhapsodes, dramatic *stikhomuthia*, riddle-contests, amoebean song as found in Theocritus, and the *skolia*. Collins' book, *The Master of the Game*, is the finest internal analysis of the dynamics of *skolia* thus far. But again my own focus is different. I would like to extend the analysis of *skolia* externally by paying more attention to social contexts more than to formal technique. I am interested in *skolia* as a social event that offers three related aspects: competition; a collective, communal basis; and creative commentary.

The precise mode of the commentary will lead me to suggest a new etymology for the name and a new proposal concerning the definition of the genre. In fact, I will question whether *skolia* even existed as a genre.

To begin, however, I must articulate a few principles for the comparative approach as I am employing it here. First, comparisons should be taken as a source of helpful analogies that can lead us to propose further hypotheses and to return to the Greek texts with new questions. But comparisons are never proofs. Finding a close similarity in another culture's poetry does not mean that a particular phenomenon within Greek had the same function or meaning as that in the other culture. Second, instead of comparing individual aspects or occurrences, we should seek as far as possible to compare larger *structures* and *patterns* of relationships. And third, as the late Calvert Watkins often declared, the most important basic starting point for comparative studies is knowing what to compare.

This third point is especially relevant when we come to *skolia*, because there are so many traditional short verse forms in other cultures, particularly those around the modern Mediterranean, which we might choose to compare. In terms of the aspect of competition, to take just one characteristic, we could investigate the Basque *bertsolaritza*, or the dueling verses found in the mountain and valley villages of Cantabria in Spain. I will not do this, because the Basque practice, of improvising small-scale poems in competition, while fascinating, is at the present day a large-scale, state-sponsored activity. Poetic competitions occur in stadiums, attended by thousands, and judged by professionals, who assign topics and even melodies and rhyme schemes. The winners become known all over Basque country. Similar events happen in Basque diaspora communities in Nevada in the western United States.[6]

You can view many of the *bertsolaritza* performances on YouTube, which is now becoming the single most important tool for modern folklorists. The Cantabrian practice, on the other hand, as the folklorist William Christian has recently shown, is now moribund. You will not find these on YouTube, except for some examples of the ossified verses ceremonially chanted on occasions like weddings. In addition, the Cantabrian verses were intended not for audience consumption but for entertainment and social commentary within small, local groups—a key distinction. These casual poems seem not to have a regular name but are generally used to "pique" (*picar*) another person, and to prompt a response. Villagers recall famous exchanges of verses. There is, for example,

6 For an excellent introduction to the form, see the essay collection edited by Armistead and Zulaika (2005).

the couplet exchange memorialized in local lore about the men of contending regions as follows:[7]

Exchange of verses, 19th c. Polaciones (Cantabria)

a) *Asomarse a la ventana/abrid puertas y balcones, veréis ir en ringlera/ los tochos de Polaciones.*
b) *Del valle de Polaciones/sacó el rey sus consejeros; Del condado de Pernía/ pastores y borregueros*

a) Look out the window/ open doors and balconies. See lined up/ the dolts of Polaciones.
b) From the valley of Polaciones/ the king chose his advisors; From the county of Pernía/ his shepherds and sheep drivers.

But the current generation does not engage in such short improvised poems. The small-group, intimate nature of the exchanges does resemble the situation of the *skolia* used in the intimacy of the symposium. By contrast, however, the Cantabrian verses are openly satirical, part of conversational dueling, and thus closer in tone to the iambic poetry of ancient Greece and Rome. This is *not* the tone of most *skolia*. Applying our principle—to compare structures, including structures of tone and attitude—we should therefore pass over this very interesting set of Cantabrian evidence.

The *payadores* of Argentina, the *loias* of Galicia, the *guajiros* of Cuba, the *trovas* of Cartagena and the *mourao* of Brazil—all present themselves as other possible *comparanda*. But one need not go this far afield. There is a strikingly strong tradition of improvised poetry, in the same language as the ancient *skolia*, still very much alive today. I refer to the Cretan verse form known as *mandinadha*. The name of the genre, most likely deriving from Italian *mattinata* "morning song" or "serenade," points toward a genesis sometime in the four-hundred year Venetian occupation of the island.[8] The rhyming couplets are in a 15-syllable meter, which is most likely a Byzantine verse-form. A sample couplet will give a brief impression of content and style, as well as the pride taken by Cretans in their distinctive oral-poetic form:[9]

7 From Christian (2005) 129.
8 Sykäri (2011) 90.
9 Papadaki-Lampaki (2011) 253.

I pio kali k'i pio sofi anthropi ston planiti
I mandinadoloyi su, monakrivi mu Kriti

The finest and the wisest people on the planet
Are your tellers of mandinadhes, my precious Crete!

The Finnish folklorist Venla Sykäri spent several years investigating the communicative features of *mandinadhes* in the Milopotamos valley of Central Crete. I draw on her analyses and also those of an anthropologist who worked in the same area in the 1980s, Michael Herzfeld. I am able to supplement their work with my own experience of the genre during fieldwork trips in western Crete between 1996 and 2003.

All three features that I have listed already occur in the Cretan *mandinadhes*. First, they can be the medium for a *competition* between two persons who compose and improvise while performing. From the many possible examples, I note one Cretan exchange as quoted by Michael Herzfeld.[10] Two men from the same village, but different kin groups, were attending a wedding reception. The place was crowded. The first man tried to get the second to move out of his way, by saying a *mandinadha*:

Asinopodhia ce kladhia, fiyete' po brosta mu
Yati tha sase kapsune ta seria ta dhika mu.

Brushwood and branches, get out of my way
or my own hands will set fire to you!

The other man, sitting directly across from him, responded:

Leye tsi mandinadhes su, ma na' sis ce to nu su,
Ya tha se pane sikoto sto spiti tu ciru su.

Sing your mandinadhes but keep your wits about you too
or you'll be manhandled all the way to your father's house.

The first man, then, in embarrassment, answered:

Me ta ciparisoksila tin kanune tim porta.
Oli i anthropi na milun ce si, ghaidhuri, sopa.

10 Herzfeld (1985) 208.

> With cypress wood they make the door
> and all men speak—but you, donkey, shut up.

At this, the second gentleman, extremely angry, jumped up with a knife and threatened to stab his interlocutor, but was restrained by many other men. Only after some days were the two villagers reconciled.

Not all the *mandinadhes* in such Cretan social competition lead to knife-fighting, but as Herzfeld explains, this particular event called into question the efficacy of the first man's singing, as if he were an outsider without sense or honor. What is being evaluated in the competition of such songs within a group is nothing less than manhood. What may be remembered later on is the aesthetic quality of the actual verses.

As Herzfeld and Skykäri point out, the evaluation of the aesthetic quality of verses can be competently done by anyone in a village because the art of *mandinadhes* is *collective* at several levels. There is widespread knowledge of the genre and how to compose distichs. Generally acknowledged to be the most productive form of folk poetry in Crete, *mandinadhes* are recited or sung by people of all ages, men and women, in all parts of the island, although musical accompaniment differs from east to west. They are in use during parties and festivals and can occur in all sorts of small-group meetings. I myself have experienced the gendered use of *mandinadhes* at one long late-evening party in the village Karanos south of Khania.[11] While men at one end of a table sang longer and serious *rizitika*—poems often focused on Cretan heroic attitudes and events—a group of women at the other end merrily and constantly exchanged *mandinadhes* about sex.

Mandinadhes are woven into conversations in the way that proverbs or anecdotes are used to enrich discourse. In addition, a conversation can start *about* how a *mandinadha* may have been successfully employed by a person, sometimes years earlier.[12] This collective, social nature of the *mandinadhes* has actually been aided by modern telecommunications (which may cause us to re-think our casual laments about smart phones as conversation-killers). Nowadays, some of the most productive *mandhinadoloyi* or composers communicate every day with friends and one another by text-messaging. To sum up, in Crete these short two-line poems are a way of life, and they create an enrichment of social life at all levels.

11 Martin, personal field notebook, June 1996.

12 Sykäri (2011) 140.

It is this collective appreciation of the art of *mandinadhes* that enables Cretans to use the genre for the third aspect that one finds also in *skolia*—namely, *creative* commentary. In this regard, there is no contradiction between a collective tradition and the important role of individual talent, working within and extending the traditional form. Authors are successful because they can manipulate the "anonymous" form. In turn, their compositions may one day enter the tradition, worn away to anonymity in some contexts, while carefully prized as personal creations in others—even years later. A good illustration of this is the way in which the re-use of a well-known couplet in a new situation can be conceived as a "new" poem. Text and context combine to make the "new" composition. To return to the Cretan men's exchange mentioned above the first couplet "brushwood and branches get out of my way" can be seen as a general statement, a poetic apostrophe applied to any difficulty that the speaker claims he will overcome by his own strength. Similar verses can be found in the printed anthologies of thousands of *mandinadhes*.[13] But the event described by Herzfeld seems to have represented a new application of the lines. Nevertheless, the second man's reply treats this *as just another* old *mandinadha*—undercutting the power of the new and fresh application.

What bears stressing, however, as regards the creative commentary of this particular *mandinadha*, is its metaphorical, and above all, *indirect* expression. Troubles—or the man who sits opposite—are compared to brushwood and branches. The poem in fact presents the speaker as polite and less threatening than he could have been, precisely because it relies on such *indirection*. In a striking image, the speaker addresses not his opponent but the "wood."

As we look at the *mandinadhes* as they are actually used in social performance—and not just as they occur in thematic categories within the anthologies—it emerges that *indirection* has been essential to their successful survival and growth. Because, like proverbs, *they can be re-used* and re-applied in so many situations, *mandinadhes* about life and love, pain and old age, Crete itself and the world, circulate and gain a place in social discourse. And just as with proverbs, a speaker can always disavow any direct intention of commenting on the behavior of friends of enemies, by making the particular situation into just one more instantiation of a more general condition.

Indirection in the use of *mandinadhes* has played a central role in their use for flirtation and courting, at least up until the mid 20th century in Crete. They allowed men and women to "talk" poetically without seeming to talk *directly* to one another concerning love and sex. As Sykäri points out (p. 31),

13 Spyridakis (2004) has a good selection in translation, with further bibliography.

it is through *mandinadhes* that Cretan men can still express affective and romantic sentiments that are discouraged in their everyday discourse within a culture still marked by distinctive machismo. Men accompanied by friends used to sing *mandinadhes* outside the homes of their intended girlfriends. The affective nature of the couplets makes them appropriate also for singing during the preparations of the bride at weddings. The element of competition can be tied into this affective and communicative use. For example one form of *mandinadhes*, the *antikristes*, involves an alternating exchange of couplets between a man and a woman. Precisely because the community knows the diction and tropes and situations associated with *mandinadhes*, any given speaker never has to spell out completely his or her message. Also, because the *mandinadhes* are employed at events meant to encourage closer social bonds, there is a special value placed on their expression of certain shared moods, toward the goal of creating fellow-feeling. Instead of speaking harshly or directly, people speak—as it were—"slantwise" to the occasion.

And with that word you will divine exactly where we have been heading with this structural comparison. Just as we know that *skolia* in ancient Greece were competitive, and were widespread in use, showing a collective nature, so, too, they can be seen as creative comments of an indirect type. The word *skolion*, I submit, captures precisely this "indirect," slanted, crooked, para-discourse. In other words, the term *skolion* applied to these poems is *not* immediately concerned with *how* one performs them within the sympotic space, but more with the *attitude* and self-positioning that one brings to the performance. I prefer this broad definition to the best modern solution so far offered by another scholar. Vayos Liapis has proposed that *skolion* refers to allusive language, puns and double entendres of a sexual nature. However, as I see it, his solution applies only to a limited number of the actual anonymous poems we possess—mostly those about Harmodios.[14] Furthermore, it does not help us with the *skolia* attributed to actual poets such as Pindar, a problem I will revisit soon.

Let me emphasize that the more abstract definition that I offer here does not preclude the folk etymology, or ancient scholarly definition that refers *skolion* to the zig-zag performance custom of handing off the succession of song indirectly (as opposed to an expected strict linear succession). Sometimes this hand-off is literalized by the handing over of a twig of myrtle to the next person chosen. What I would say now is that the zig-zag trick is itself a

14 Liapis (1996).

kind of social insurance. It is the embodiment and public display of the vital notion that anything said within the *skolion* is *not* intended as a direct comment on the person sitting opposite, or for that matter on any person in the room (even though, of course, it might well be). Handing off the song in this random manner—a gimmick worthy of John Cage—assures the group that the addressee is conveniently vague. There is no "opposition" as it were—physically or socially. I cannot resist noting further here that such a set of socially accepted pragmatic protocols, if widespread, would make rather questionable if not actually ridiculous the attempts by modern scholars to positively identify speaking "I's" and addressee "you's" in various sorts of ancient poetry. The poetry itself is, by my estimation, designed precisely to circumvent and undermine any such easy identifications. It embeds multiplicity, indirection, and fuzziness.

So much for the hypothesis, derived from an analysis of comparative materials. Now to test it. To illustrate the combination of competition, collective awareness, and especially, the commentary through indirection, we might turn to the earliest representation in Greek literature of an exchange of *skolia*, in Aristophanes' *Wasps*, from 422 BCE. This exchange can be divided into four separate turn-takings (marked below by Roman capital letters). We must look at the entire passage to appreciate its movement:

(A)
Βδ. αὐλητρὶς ἐνεφύσησεν· οἱ δὲ συμπόται
εἰσὶν Θέωρος, Αἰσχίνης, Φᾶνος, Κλέων,
ξένος τις ἕτερος πρὸς κεφαλῆς, Ἀκέστορος.
τούτοις ξυνὼν **τὰ σκόλι' ὅπως δέξει καλῶς**.
Φι. ἄληθες; ὡς οὐδείς γε Διακρίων ἐγώ.
Βδ. τάχ' εἴσομαι· καὶ δὴ γάρ εἰμ' ἐγὼ Κλέων,
ᾄδω δὲ πρῶτος Ἁρμοδίου, δέξει δὲ σύ.
"οὐδεὶς πώποτ' ἀνὴρ ἔγεντ' Ἀθήναις—"
Φι.—οὐχ οὕτω γε πανοῦργος ⟨οὐδὲ⟩ κλέπτης.
Βδ. τουτὶ σὺ δράσεις; παραπολεῖ βοώμενος·
φήσει γὰρ ἐξολεῖν σε καὶ διαφθερεῖν
κἀκ τῆσδε τῆς γῆς ἐξελᾶν.

(B)
Φι. ἐγὼ δέ γε,
ἐὰν ἀπειλῇ, νὴ Δί' ἑτέραν ᾄσομαι·
"ὤνθρωφ', οὗτος ὁ μαιόμενος τὸ μέγα κράτος,
ἀντρέψεις ἔτι τὰν πόλιν· ἁ δ' ἔχεται ῥοπᾶς."

(C)
Βδ. τί δ' ὅταν Θέωρος πρὸς ποδῶν κατακείμενος
ᾄδῃ Κλέωνος λαβόμενος τῆς δεξιᾶς·
"Ἀδμήτου λόγον, ὦταῖρε, μαθὼν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς φίλει." 1238–1239
τούτῳ τί λέξεις σκόλιον; (*1240*)
Φι. ᾠδί πως ἐγώ.
"οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλωπεκίζειν, 1241
οὐδ' ἀμφοτέροισι γίγνεσθαι φίλον."

(D)
Βδ. μετὰ τοῦτον Αἰσχίνης ὁ Σέλλου δέξεται,
ἀνὴρ σοφὸς καὶ μουσικός, κᾆτ' ᾄσεται·
"χρήματα καὶ βίον 1245
Κλειταγόρᾳ τε κἀμοὶ μετὰ Θετταλῶν—"
Φι.—**πολλὰ** δὴ διεκόμπασας σὺ κἀγώ.
Βδ. τουτὶ μὲν **ἐπιεικῶς σύ γ' ἐξεπίστασαι:** 1248–1249
ὅπως δ' ἐπὶ δεῖπνον εἰς Φιλοκτήμονος ἴμεν

AR. *Wasps* 1219–1250

Bdelycleon: The flute-player has finished the prelude. [1220] The guests are Theorus, Aeschines, Phanus, Cleon, Acestor; and beside this last, I don't know who else. You are with them *and will take up the* ***skolia*** *in a fine manner.*

Philocleon: Really? None of the Diacrians will show them as well as I.

Bdelycleon: That we shall see. Suppose me to be Cleon. [1225] I am the first to begin the song of Harmodius, and you take it up: "There never yet was seen in Athens ...

Philocleon: ... such a rogue or such a thief."

Bdelycleon: Why, you wretched man, it will be the end of you if you sing that. He will vow your ruin, your destruction, [1230] to chase you out of the country.

Philocleon: Well! then I shall answer his threats with another song: "With your madness for supreme power, [1235] you will end by overthrowing the city, which even now totters towards ruin."

Bdelycleon: And when Theorus, prone at Cleon's feet, takes his hand and sings, "Like Admetus, love those who are brave," [1240] *what* ***skolion/*** *slanted thing will you say to this*?

Philocleon: I shall sing, "I know not how to play the fox, nor call myself the friend of both parties."

Bdelycleon: Then comes the turn of Aeschines, the son of Sellus, and a

well-trained and clever musician, who will sing, [1245] "Good things and riches for Clitagora and me and also for the Thessalians!"
Philocleon: "The two of us have had a boasting contest about many things."
Bdelycleon: This *you seem to understand thoroughly and properly.* [1250] But come, we will go and dine with Philoctemon.

tr. EUGENE O'NEILL, JR. *with modifications*

As part of his plan to reform his father, Bdelukleon prepares the old man for a symposium at which various elite figures will appear. The two men act out a rehearsal for this upcoming event. Bdelukleon, the son, sets the scene. After the musical interlude, when the symposiasts begin talking, the father is supposed to "take up the *skolia* in a fine way" (τούτοις ξυνὼν τὰ σκόλι' ὅπως δέξει καλῶς.)

Turn A: When Kleon the demagogic politician sings a well-known anti-tyrannical song about Harmodius, the father should pick up the second verse: to Kleon's recitation of "No man ever was at Athens" (οὐδεὶς πώποτ' ἀνὴρ ἔγεντ' Ἀθήναις—), Philokleon says he will respond "so villainous or such a thief." (οὐχ οὕτω γε πανοῦργος ⟨οὐδὲ⟩ κλέπτης).

This is comical because, of course, Philokleon despite his love for Kleon's demagogic politics here unwittingly reveals the truth through an innovative twist on the old song. It is also humorous, I would add, in failing to be properly *skolion*. That is, instead of being allusive, metaphorical, and "crooked" to the situation, Philokleon's verse is a direct assault on the tyrant-slayer Harmodius—and by implication, on the pseudo-democrat Kleon.

Turn B: Bdelukleon reacts with astonishment: "You'll say this? Kleon will destroy you and exile you". Well, if he threatens, says Philokleon the father, I will sing

"ὦνθρωφ', οὗτος ὁ μαιόμενος τὸ μέγα κράτος, (*1232–1234*)
ἀντρέψεις ἔτι τὰν πόλιν· ἁ δ' ἔχεται ῥοπᾶς." (*1235*)

"With your madness for supreme power, [1235]
you will end by overthrowing the city, which even now totters towards ruin."

Bdelukleon does not react to this. There is a good reason for his acquiesence: according to the scholiast, Philokleon has slightly altered some old verses of Alcaeus, while making them fit his fellow symposiast, Kleon. Says the commentator: "He 'parodies' (*paroideî*) Kleon." (Worth special notice is the *para-*

prefix, which should remind one of *parabasis* and *parphasis*—two other indirect phenomena of interest to the ethnographer of ancient Greek speaking.)[15] Philokleon, in other words, is in the course of this single passage learning the game of indirection. Although he failed at the first turn, now he makes an indirect attack under the disguise of citing some verses of the great melic poet of Lesbos who lived nearly two centuries earlier. His son therefore does not need to criticize his performance this time.

Turn C: For the third round, Bdelukleon imagines that Theoros will take up the song from Kleon (while grasping his right hand) and will sing the famous "Admêtou logos" about learning who are the good and loving them. This song, attested elsewhere, is itself a fine example of indirection *skolion* within the context of the symposium. It addresses the problem of true and false friendship, with which we know Greek males of the archaic and classical periods were obsessed.[16] Bdelukleon asks: "To this *"ti lexeis skolion"?* (τούτῳ τί λέξεις σκόλιον; 1240). We can translate this phrase either as having a nominal: "what *skolion* will you sing?" or—as I would prefer—an adjectival interpretation: "What thing (ti) indirectly-relating-to this (*toûto skólion*) will you sing?" Given the scribal practices of 5th century Greece, we cannot be sure whether the original accentuation was oxytone or proparoxytone (**skolión* or *skólion*).[17] There are other issues at work here involving accent shift and the *formation des noms*. At any rate, it is possible that the lines from the *Wasps* enable us to witness the birth of a genre name out of a more general adjectival description. The "indirect song" is born from "what is crooked or indirect."

Philokleon, faced with the Admetos song, does not recite what some sources say is the actual second verse ("stay away from the bad people, knowing that from the bad there is no thanks"). Instead, he innovates by singing the words "One cannot play the fox nor be friendly with both sides" ("οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλωπεκίζειν, (1241) οὐδ᾽ ἀμφοτέροισι γίγνεσθαι φίλον.") His response, that is to say, is just as indirect yet full of meaning as is the initial song of Admetos, while it challenges the meaning. If Admetos' logos was regularly interpreted to mean "be discreet and careful who your friends are," Philokleon's reply can be interpreted as "I will always be forthright about *my* friends."

Turn D: In the final turn, Philokleon clearly achieves the full skill needed to sing *skolia* at symposia. We know this because his mentor—i.e., *his* son—

15 Literary and social phenomena covered by these terms are discussed in e.g. Miller (1982) and Bakola (2008).

16 See Scodel (1979).

17 On the contrasting accentuation of the noun vs. adjective, see Chantraine (1999) 1013 s.v. *skelos*.

says, at the end of the turn, "**This** you seem to understand thoroughly and properly" (τουτὶ μὲν ἐπιεικῶς σύ γ' ἐξεπίστασαι). When Aischines, a wise and clever musician, will sing "Good things and riches for *Clitagora* and me and also for the Thessalians!" (χρήματα καὶ βίον /*Κλειταγόρᾳ* τε κἀμοὶ μετὰ Θετταλῶν), Philocleon will answer "The two of us have had a boasting contest about …" We can read this as an indirect subversion of the declaration of Aischines, which apparently refers to a success at gaining what he wants. Philokleon, by his verses, in effect says "that is just your claim, but it is open to dispute." Here the old man reaches a meta-poetic level comparable to that of many expert *mandinadha-singers*. Like Herzfeld's Cretan competitor, Philokleon puts down his opponent by saying "that is just *some old song* you are singing."

We can put my new definition of *skolia* as "indirect songs" to two additional tests, as we conclude.

First, it should be possible to see in the corpus of 25 anonymous *skolia* at least the possibility of an indirect application. I shall suggest that the following *skolia* easily accommodate this characteristic: *PMG* 889, 891–892, 897, 900–901, 903–905. Notice in particular how well the notion of "indirection" fits the *skolia* which are clearly allegorical, such as *PMG* 891. There is also the fantastic *mise en abyme* of the crab and snake poem—which wonderfully thematizes the very notion of what it is to be *skolion* by means of an ironic pot calling the kettle black, at the same time opening up a sympotic style riddle: what is twistier, a snake or a crab?

Second, my new definition should explain more clearly how the *skolia* attributed to named poets can be integrated into the same category as the anonymous short songs. This question is one of the central concerns of Greg Jones' dissertation. His answer is that the genre of *skolia* is bounded by the parameters of 1) a relaxed performance situation and style; 2) Aeolic meter; and 3) gnomic quality in the texts. These parameters, however, appear to be oddly specific, on the one hand (the metrical test) and on the other frustratingly vague (e.g. what is "relaxed"?). My own definition is, as I have now indicated, the opposite of Jones'. I have a two-part answer to the question "what is a *skolion*"? There are a few poems identified as *skolia* that do show signs of indirection. The longest such poem, and the only one to identify itself as a *skolion*, is attributed to Pindar by Athenaeus:

Α' Πολύξεναι νεάνιδες, ἀμφίπολοι
Πειθοῦς ἐν ἀφνειῷ Κορίνθῳ,
αἵ τε τᾶς χλωρᾶς λιβάνου ξανθὰ δάκρη
θυμιᾶτε, πολλάκι ματέρ' ἐρώτων
οὐρανίαν πτάμεναι

νοήματι πρὸς Ἀφροδίταν, (*5*)

—

Β' ὑμῖν ἄνευθ' ἐπαγορίας ἔπορεν,
ὦ παῖδες, ἐρατειναῖς ⟨ἐν⟩ εὐναῖς
μαλθακᾶς ὥρας ἀπὸ καρπὸν δρέπεσθαι.
σὺν δ' ἀνάγκᾳ πὰν καλὸν ...
(desunt vv. 10–12)
(Γ') **ἀλλὰ θαυμάζω, τί με λέξοντι Ἰσθμοῦ (*13**)**
δεσπόται τοιάνδε μελίφρονος ἀρχὰν (*14)**
εὑρόμενον *σκολίου* (*14**)
ξυνάορον ξυναῖς γυναιξίν. (*15**)

You girls who welcome many guests as servants of Peitho in sumptuous Corinth, you who burn the pale tears of green incense while often in thought you fly up towards the mother of loves, Aphrodite Ourania

—to you she grants that, free of reproach and, o children, in couches of pleasure, you are to harvest the fruit of soft youth! All things are fine that comply with necessity.

(desunt vv. 10–12)

But I do wonder, what will the lords of the Isthmos say as I contrive a beginning like this for my honey-sweet ***skolion***, partner of women common to all?

PIND. fr. 122 Maehler. tr. A.P. Burnett

Leslie Kurke has written about this in some detail and I follow her explication.[18] The poem, sung at a symposium celebrating the dedication of 100 *hetairai* to Aphrodite, shows clear signs of indirection in its phrasing. To call *hetairai* "young women who welcome many guests" and "attendants of persuasion" is certainly a slanted way of naming. What is remarkable about this composition—at least the portion which we have—is that the poet Pindar actually places in the foreground the problem of his own allusivity and of the interpretation by his audience. "I wonder what the lords of the Isthmos will say of my devising such a beginning as this for a honey-minded *skolion*." It is as if Pindar plays with the inherently indirect nature of his poem. Perhaps he also pushes the boundaries by extending the shared indirection beyond the immediate group of men gathered to listen to his song at a symposium. Instead, he *appears*—the addressee is conveniently vague—to ask someone other than his Corinthian compeers (the women? himself?) about the nature of the ded-

18 Kurke (1996).

icatory act involved, which is also conveniently under-determined: are these temple prostitutes whose longer-term job is to honor Aphrodite for pay? In that case, the obfuscation about their status (hostesses, attendants) is rather obvious but chivalrous. Or are they free-lance high-class party girls "dedicated" only for a night, courtesy of Xenophon's resources? In which case the affiliation suggested with Aphrodite cult is another sort of indirect compliment. As often with Pindar, it all comes down to who pays whom; but as always he's never going to reveal that.

Now one might ask—do not all of Pindar's poems pose problems of interpretation, of obscurity, euphemism and allusion? To which I would agree. And this brings me to my simplest solution as to why so many ancient poets—at least a dozen from Alcaeus to Aristotle—are said to have composed *skolia*. The fact is that *any poem*, if re-performed in a symposium with the goal of making an indirect commentary on the situation or social relations, can by my definition—and I suspect, by ancient standards—be *skolion*, in the sense of "indirect." In other words, there were no specific *skolia* composed as such by the poets, nor were they conscious of some specific delimited genre bearing that name. Their compositions—melic or other—became *skolia* in performance—and ceased to be *skolia* thereafter, unless they happened to be remembered along with their original performance contexts. To state this even more simply: there never was a *genre* of skolia, there was only a rhetorical strategy of indirection, for which any verbal art piece was fair game.

I would add that all of the elegiac corpus of Theognis and other poets could easily qualify as *skolia* in this sense—and in fact there are well know significant overlaps in diction, theme, and the habit of thematic "chaining" between elegiac verses and our surviving *skolia*, for which Collins gives a number of examples.[19] Finally, you might ask (always a useful come-back) what could *not* be a *skolion* under my terms? What could *not* be indirect? There is in fact a genre—or, I should say, an opposed strategy of self-presentation—that in time also ossified into an alleged "genre" but began as a much more flexible approach to the poetry of the symposium: namely, *iambos* the poetry of insult and abuse.[20] Iambos thrives and succeeds on the basis of its being direct. In sum, these two ruling practices—ready-made strategies for handling the intense social mix of the symposium—represent the two great hemispheres of ancient sympotic versemaking. And that is telling it to you straight.

19 Collins (2004).

20 On the shape and history of the genre, see now Rotstein (2009) and Lavigne (2005).

Bibliography

Armistead, S., and J. Zulaika, eds. 2005. *Voicing the Moment: Improvised Oral Poetry and Basque Tradition*. Reno.

Bakola, E. 2008. "The Drunk, the Reformer and the Teacher: Agonistic Poetics and the Construction of Persona in the Comic Poets of the Fifth Century." *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 54: 1–29

Baltussen, H., and P. Davis, eds. 2015. *The Art of Veiled Speech: Self-Censorship from Aristophanes to Hobbes*. Philadelphia

Bredehoft, T.A. 2009. *Authors, Audiences, and Old English Verse*. Toronto.

Burnett, A. 2011. "Servants of Peitho: Pindar fr. 122 S." *GRBS* 51: 49–60.

Bynum, D.E. 1974. "Child's Legacy Enlarged: Oral Literary Studies at Harvard since 1856." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 22: 237–267.

Chantraine, P. 1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque, avec supplément*. Paris.

Christian, W. 2005. "The Sting in the Tail: The Flourishing and Decline of Improvised Verse in the Mountains of Cantabria." In Armistead and Zulaika, ed. 2005: 162–182.

Collins, D. 2004. *Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry*. Washington.

Fabbro, E. 1995. *Carmina Convivalia Attica*. Rome.

Harrison, J.E. 1927 [2010]. *Themis*. 2nd ed. Cambridge.

Herzfeld, M. 1985. "Interpretation from Within: Metatext for a Cretan Quarrel." In *Post-structuralist Approaches to Modern Greek Literature*, ed. M. Alexiou and V. Lambropoulos, 197–218. New York.

Ives, E.D. 1997. "'How Got the Apples In?': Individual Creativity and Ballad Tradition." *The Folklore Historian* 14: 31–40.

Jones, G. 2007. *Singing the Skolion: A Study of Poetics and Politics in Ancient Greece*. Diss. Johns Hopkins.

Kurke, L. 1996. "Pindar and the Prostitutes, or Reading Ancient 'Pornography'." *Arion* 4: 49–75.

Lavigne, D. 2005. *Iambic Configurations: Iambos from Archilochus to Horace*. Diss. Stanford.

Liapis, V. 1996. "Double Entendres in Skolia: The Etymology of Skolion." *Eranos* 94: 111–122.

Martin, R.P. 2007. "Homer among the Irish: Yeats, Synge, Thomson." In *Homer in the Twentieth Century: Between World Literature and the Western Canon*, ed. E. Greenwood and B. Graziosi, 75–91. Oxford.

Miller, A. 1982. "Phthonos and Parphasis: The Argument of *Nemean* 8.19–34." *GRBS* 23: 111–120.

Papadaki-Lampaki, E. 2011. *Kritikes mantinadhes. Nea anthologia*. Athens.

Rotstein, A. 2009. *The Idea of Iambos*. Oxford.

Sargent, H.C., and G.L. Kittredge, ed. 1904. *English and Scottish Popular Ballads, edited from the collection of Francis James Child*. Boston.

Scodel R. 1979. "Admetou Logos and the *Alcestis*." *HSCP* 83: 51–62.

Sykäri, V. 2011. *Words as Events: Cretan Mantinádes in Performance and Composition*. Helsinki.

Spyridakis, S. 2004. *The Voice of the People: Mantinades of Crete*. New York.

CHAPTER 4

Placing the Poet: The Topography of Authorship

Nicholas Boterf

Authorship by and large simplifies the complex process of poetic creation. The concept of authorship takes the inherently social process of creating a text and reduces it down to the genius of a single individual. This is most evident in theatre, where the collaborative and social process of writing, directing, and staging a play is attributed to the artistic creation of an individual playwright, whether Shakespeare or Sophocles.[1] This tension between the collective group and a singular authorial genius manifests itself more recently in cinematic auteur theory and its critiques.[2] But even in the case of non-collaborative arts, we have reasons for seeing forces at work that simply cannot be equated with the author. As Foucault and Barthes have reminded us, even if a work is penned in isolation by a single person, the work is still shot through and through with the ideological power structures of the society that the author inhabits.[3] An author's work in some sense belongs to this society just as much as it does to the writer. Even in the case of a single writer authorship often seems like a deliberate simplification, and maybe even misrepresentation, of the complex realities of artistic production.

This makes it all the more important to understand, when discussing archaic and classical concepts of authorship, what information is included and what is excluded. What is needed to make an author in ancient Greece? And just as important, what data is left out? This paper will focus on one of most fundamental, yet often ignored, aspects of authorship: the author's name itself. Though authors' names seem to be on the surface an arbitrary part of the poetic process (couldn't Shakespeare have written *Romeo and Juliet* under any other name?), postmodern scholarship has shown that an author's name has wider implications for concepts of authorship. As Michel Foucault has noted in his famous essay "What is an Author?" an author's name is never just a proper name. It functions as a means to classify, authenticate, and identify a text or a

1 For the creation of the author in Elizabethan drama, see Erne (2003) 56–77.

2 A good overview of the origins of auteur theory can be found in Gerstner (2003) 6–11. For an incisive, influential critique of auteur theory, see Kael (1963), esp. 18–20.

3 See Foucault (2001) [1969]; Barthes (1977).

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_006

tradition in a wide variety of discourses.[4] Authors' names are not neutral facts: they are created, and themselves create, a series of contexts for the reception and performance of an author's work. The way in which an author's name is presented, therefore, can provide us with important insights on ancient conceptions of authorship.

Before we proceed, my use of the terms "author" and "authorship" needs to be addressed. As has been noted by many scholars, the concept of "authorship" is a problematic one in the predominantly oral song culture of archaic and classical Greece.[5] I choose to use the word "author" here in order to emphasize the wide range of genres and texts mentioned in this discussion. Although my focus will be on poets, it is my contention that they are best analyzed using broader conceptions of authorship and authority in archaic and classical Greece.[6] I therefore use the term "author" in a very weak sense, meaning an individual to whom a text or series of texts is attributed. The poet in these cases is considered to be the creative force behind these texts, one whose presence validates the text and transforms it into a "work."[7] I want to emphasize, however, that this definition does not exclude *performance*, or for that matter, *reperformance*, as a means to authorship.[8] Theognis, after all, in the beginning of his famous *sphragis* poem claims some sort of ownership over his work and then goes on to immediately describe local reperformances of it throughout Greece.[9] It appears that performance and reperformance of oral texts are attributed to authors just as much as written texts.

4 See esp. Foucault (2001) [1969] 1626–1628.

5 One of the most influential treatments of authorship in archaic Greece can be found in Nagy (1990) 339–381; see also Ford (1985) for a perceptive analysis of the dynamics of authorship in the case of Theognis. For a recent comparison of authorship in ancient Greece and China, see Beecroft (2010), esp. 1–25.

6 As recent studies have emphasized, the historiographical "I" in prose was heavily influenced by both archaic epic and lyric poetry: for Hecataeus, see Bertelli (2001) 80–82; for Herodotus, see Marincola (2006).

7 In this regard the distinction Nehamas (1986) 686 draws between "authors" and "writers" is useful. As he argues, "Writers are actual individuals, firmly located in history, efficient causes of their texts ... Writers truly exist outside their texts. They have no interpretive authority over them ... An author, by contrast, is whoever can be understood to have produced a particular text as we interpret it. Authors are not individuals but characters manifested or exemplified, though not depicted or described, in texts. They are formal causes ... Their nature guides interpretation, and interpretation determines their nature."

8 For performances as a means to authorship, see Beecroft (2010) 17.

9 See ll. 19–24 West *IEG*^{2}.

In this discussion I focus on a very specific phenomenon: when an author identifies himself as the creator of the work within the text itself. As scholars have frequently noted, these moments of "self-naming" operate differently than normal mentions of authors' names.[10] As Calame observes, the act of self-naming is inherently "extradiscursive"; it motions towards a reality beyond the text itself.[11] Self-naming creates an implicit association between the "I" of the poem and a person outside of this poem. Such a link to a reality outside the text may in fact be fictitious, but acts of self-naming embed this extra-textual figure within the text itself.[12] It is notable that in archaic and classical literature the scarce few words authors provide about themselves are often all we know about the author. If somehow we lost the few words that comprise an instance of self-naming, our text would be practically unidentifiable. It should therefore be emphasized that these authorial statements are an important but a quantifiably *small* part of the overall text.

With these definitions and clarifications in mind let us turn to the topic of naming practices. In modern day English, one can address someone in face-to-face conversation in a number of ways: by first name alone, in more formal contexts by a title + last name ("Goodbye, Mr. Anderson"), by a combination of first and last name (and even expandable to a middle name), or just by a nick-name alone. While the structure first name + last name is generally restricted to a limited number of situations in everyday conversation (like mothers scolding children), when it comes to literature, the structure first name + last name becomes standard.[13] In English, the structure first name + last name regularly identifies an author of a work. This naming device persists across a wide variety of texts and genres: we can perform a play by William Shakespeare (though the fame of this author makes the first name virtually redundant), read the investigative journalism of Bob Woodward, or even cite a piece of criticism by Terry Eagleton. The modern structure first name + last name (traditionally a patronymic) indicates authorship in a wide variety of texts.

10 For a discussion of authorial self-naming utilizing enunciative theory, see Calame (1995) 3–26. See also Beecroft (2010) 1–4, who uses the term "scenes of authorship" to describe the broader phenomenon of moments when authors are described creating their work. Self-naming comprises a specific subset of instances of "scenes of authorship."

11 See Calame (1995) 3–26 *passim*, esp. e.g., 8–10, 24–26.

12 E.g., the more cynical narratological approach of Stoddard (2004) 67–68, who views Hesiod's self-naming in the *Theogony* as the biography of the "implied poet," not the real Hesiod. I would emphasize that even an "implied poet" is presented as having some reality outside of the text itself, even if that reality is fictitious.

13 I owe this discussion of forms of naming and address to Dickey (1996) 43–50, 54.

By contrast, the ancient Greeks for the most part used only their first name in face-to-face conversation.[14] Unlike English, the first name in ancient Greek has the functions of *both* the first name and last name in English. Socrates, for example, is addressed as "O Socrates" rather than Mr. Sophroniscus. And unlike the last name in modern day English, there was no set second term. If further differentiation was needed, the most common types of second terms were either a patronymic or an ethnic/demotic, but in a pinch, even a nickname (such as the "the younger Socrates") would do. Given the importance of the first name, it is not surprising that in direct addresses made in face-to-face conversation, as far as we can tell from the literary evidence, the bare first name predominates. Eleanor Dickey, in her detailed analysis of forms of address from Herodotus to Lucian, calculates that 64% of all singular addresses are by first name alone.[15] However, both patronymics and city names (so called "ethnics") can be used if the addressee needs to be specified further. Dickey tallies 55 examples of address by patronymic or some functional equivalent (e.g. matronymic), while she finds 42 instances of ethnics and place names.[16] Although Dickey primarily uses later evidence, which may or may not accurately reflect conversational practices of an earlier period, this data at the least provides an excellent point of comparison.

When we turn to archaic and classical literature we find that the most common way for an author to refer to himself is by a first name alone.[17] This should not surprise us, since, as mentioned above, the first name in Greek has many of the qualities of the last name in English. The bare first name in Greek

14 A helpful overview of Greek naming practices can be found at Finkelberg (2011) s.v. "Names, Personal" with an emphasis on Homer. For a history of scholarship on Greek names (focusing on their use as historical evidence), see Hornblower and Matthews (2000) 2–7.

15 Dickey (1996) 46.

16 For patronymics, see Dickey (1996) 52–54; for place-names, see 175. She detects a formal, deferential tone to most of these uses of patronymics (55). It should be noted, however, that nearly half of the examples of patronymics come from Plato. Dickey suggests that this is a peculiarity of Socrates' own address system (55–56). On the other hand, she sees ethnics as implying relative status, and that the social status of the addresser is superior to that of the addressee (176).

17 I count 28 instances in the archaic and classical Greek literature surveyed in this article: Sappho 1.20, 65.5, 94.5, 133 Voigt; Alcaeus 401 B Voigt; Hipponax 1 (assuming it's a genuine quotation of Hipponax), 36, 37, and 79.9 West *IEG*^{2}; Solon 33 West *IEG*^{2}; Phocylides 1, 2, 3 Gerber; Demodocus 2 West *IEG*^{2}; Alcman 17.4, 39.1 *PMGF*; Thuc. 2.70, 2.103, 3.25, 3.88, 3.116, 4.51, 4.135, 6.7, 6.93, 7.18, 8.6, 8.60.

seems to be the most "unmarked" and casual form of an author's name.[18] When we look beyond the first name, however, a surprising phenomenon occurs: authors more frequently identify themselves by city of origin (so-called "ethnics") rather than patronymics. Patronymics, with a few exceptions, disappear almost entirely from authorial self-statements. Self-reference or citation by first name remains the most common way for an author to be described, but when further differentiation was needed, ethnics were far more often used. There is some biblical precedent for the form name + city, but other naming formats are generally preferred (we will discuss these in more detail below).[19] The first poet in the Greek tradition to be identified in this way can be found in Homer, the obscure Thamyris the Thracian: "the Muses encountered Thamyris the Thracian and put an end to his song" (Μοῦσαι | ἀντόμεναι Θάμυριν τὸν Θρήϊκα παῦσαν ἀοιδῆς, *Il.* 2.594–595). By contrast, Demodocus and Phemius are never named with an ethnic in the *Odyssey*. This shows that both systems coexisted in our earliest Greek texts, and that identifying other poets by both name and place was an acceptable move in the epic tradition, and one that was likely intelligible to Homer's audience.

The two most famous archaic poets who introduce themselves by name and place are Hesiod and Theognis. However, they place themselves in very different ways. Hesiod's declaration of authorship is intimately related to a specific place, but not his actual hometown. In the *Theogony* he writes:

> αἵ νύ ποθ' Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἀοιδήν,
> ἄρνας ποιμαίνονθ' Ἑλικῶνος ὕπο ζαθέοιο.
>
> 22–23

> They [the Muses] once upon a time taught Hesiod a beautiful song, as he was tending his lambs underneath holy Helicon.

We know from the *Works and Days* (639–640) that Hesiod's hometown is actually Ascra, a village near Helicon. Strikingly, Hesiod never mentions Ascra

18 It should be noted here that in this discussion I do not differentiate between proper names and professional names. Multiple scholars have suspected that names such as Homer, Hesiod, and Terpander were invented, professional names, oftentimes reflecting the genre of song each author performed (for Homer, see Nagy (1996) 89–91; for a different view, see West (1999) 375–376; for Hesiod, see Most (2006) xiv–xvi; for Terpander, see Nagy (1979) 17 n. 4, n. 1, (1990) 86). However, there seems to be no difference in usage from these professional names and historically attested individuals (like Herodotus).

19 See Mic. 1.1 and Nah. 1.1.

either in this opening or in the rest of the work. Why then does he focus on Helicon? In part we can attribute this privileging of place of initiation over hometown to Near Eastern parallels, where the description of the exact place of a divine revelation often appears.[20] But also this is likely a product of deliberate choice: due to the proximity of the insignificant Ascra to the more well-known Helicon, Hesiod can choose which location to emphasize in his works. Hesiod likely wants the poetical authority that comes from a place associated with the Muses. Note also that Hesiod's act of self-naming is more stylized. He grammatically hides the mention of Helicon in a prepositional phrase (Ἑλικῶνος ὕπο ζαθέοιο 'under holy Helicon') separate from the mention of his own name. By contrast, Theognis in his famous *sphragis* poem uses a much more conventional and unmarked form of the structure name + place:

> Κύρνε, σοφιζομένῳ μὲν ἐμοὶ σφρηγὶς ἐπικείσθω
> τοῖσδ' ἔπεσιν, λήσει δ' οὔποτε κλεπτόμενα,
> οὐδέ τις ἀλλάξει κάκιον τοὐσθλοῦ παρεόντος,
> ὧδε δὲ πᾶς τις ἐρεῖ· 'Θεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη
> τοῦ Μεγαρέως· πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός·
>
> Cyrnus, let a seal be placed on these verses for me, a skilled and wise poet. Their theft will never pass unnoticed, nor will anyone take something worse in exchange when that which is good is at hand. And everyone will say "These are the lines of Theognis of Megara: named throughout all of mankind."
>
> Thgn. 19–23

Here Theognis claims a sort of ownership over his words by means of a *sphragis*.[21] Whatever form this *sphragis* took, for our purposes it's important to note the fame that results from it takes the structure of name + place.[22] Although often translated as "famous," the adjective ὀνομαστός literally means

20 See, e.g., Ezek. 1.3. West (1966) 158–161 provides a good overview of other parallels, both from the Near East and elsewhere.

21 For a discussion of the *sphragis*, see Bakker's contribution in this volume (Ch. 5). For the notions of ownership involved here, see Woodbury (1952) 23–25. I would argue this view is compatible with the view of Ford (1985) that the *sphragis* establishes a "text." Because Theognis "owns" his poetry, the poems attributed to him become a "text" or "work" of Theognis'. For the relationship between "author" and "work" see Nehamas (1986) 688.

22 Both Woodbury (1952) and Ford (1985) argue that the *sphragis* here is a metaphor. Hubbard (2007) 205–206 has recently resurrected the idea that the *sphragis* assumes a written text.

"named."[23] Theognis in quoted speech here gives us the precise way he expects to be named in future reperformances of his poetry. However, unlike Hesiod, Theognis uses an article and city name in the genitive (τοῦ Μεγαρέως) in parallel to his own name. Theognis' act of self-naming therefore resembles much more the neutral structure of name + place in a way that Hesiod's stylized invocation of his place of initiation (and not his home city) does not.[24]

The ancient historiographical tradition beginning with Hecataeus, however, is where we see the clearest examples of the name + place structure.[25] Unlike the looser use of first name + place to indicate authorship in Hesiod and Theognis, in historiography a more rigid formula was established: first name + ethnic as an adjective. While there remained some flexibility in framing one's act of self-naming, it's overall a much more definable formula than appears in Hesiod and Theognis, and as we will discuss below, also Timotheus. In our extant literature this formula begins with a well-known fragment of Hecataeus:

> Ἑκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται· τάδε γράφω, ὥς μοι δοκεῖ ἀληθέα εἶναι· οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοί τε καὶ γελοῖοι, ὡς ἐμοὶ φαίνονται, εἰσίν
> *FGrHist* 1 F 1a

> Hecataeus the Milesian speaks the following: what I write is in my opinion true. For the stories of the Greeks are both many and ridiculous, as they seem to me.

Hecataeus' name (as well as Herodotus' and Thucydides') functioned as a title in later antiquity and was repeated at the end of the work.[26] Pinning down the exact inspiration for the naming structure Hecataeus chose is difficult.[27] For my purposes I would like to emphasize the links in this passage to earlier

---

23 As Woodbury (1952) 25–26 notes.

24 These differences in how Hesiod and Theognis name themselves pushes against scholars who have seen a direct intertextual link between the two because they both name themselves in line 22 of their poems (see Renehan (1980) 339–340; Hubbard (2007) 206). I think it is more likely a coincidence that would not be noticed in an oral performance.

25 An excellent overview of naming practices in ancient historiography can be found in Marincola (1997) 271–275.

26 See Dio Chrys. *Or*. 53. 9–10; for discussion, see Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella (2007) 1.

27 For dedications as a source of this "tag," see Svenbro (1988) 149–150; for seals more generally as the source, see Detienne (1986) 71–72; for the influence of Near Eastern naming practices on Hecataeus, see Marincola (1997) 271–272; Corcella (1996) sees more specifically Near Eastern victory seals as the source (Bertelli (2001) 80 concurs with Corcella).

Greek poetry.[28] Hecataeus provides one such link himself in the words ὧδε μυθεῖται, whose only precedent is the phrase ὧδε δὲ μυθέομαι that appears once in Homer.[29] This, combined with the clear intertext with the Hesiodic Muses, who know how to speak both lies and the truth (ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, / ἴδμεν δ' εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι, *Theog*. 27–28), indicates that Hecataeus is placing himself in a literary tradition that begins with Homer and Hesiod.[30] Hecataeus' preface, regardless of its precise origins, lays claims to the same authority available to archaic poets.

Herodotus follows Hecataeus in immediately describing himself by name and place:

> Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε
>
> Hdt. 1.1

> This is the performance of Herodotus of Halicarnassus of his investigation …

It is likely that Herodotus' name, like Hecataeus', was repeated at the end of the work in ancient copies.[31] Unlike Hecataeus and later Thucydides, however, Herodotus does not describe himself speaking or writing his history with a finite verb, naming himself instead in a genitive clause attached to the phrase ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε. Herodotus in this regard shows more flexibility than either his predecessor or his successor. It is also important to note that in antiquity the textual variant Θουρίου also circulated in place of Ἁλικαρνησσέος. This variant is attested by Plutarch but is rejected not only by Plutarch himself but also by most modern scholars.[32] In this case, Herodotus still defines himself by using a place name, his home of exile and place of death, Thurii, rather than his birthplace, Halicarnassus.

28 For a helpful overview of the Greek literary influences on Herodotus see Marincola (2007).

29 *Il.* 7.76. See Bertelli (2001) 80.

30 For Hecataeus' intertext with Hesiod, see Pearson (1939) 97–98; Calame (1995) 92–93; Bertelli (2001) 80–82 is more skeptical of the influence. For the influence of epic on the historians, see Marincola (2006) *passim*, but especially 14–16.

31 See n. 26 above. Neither Hude nor Legrande print this in their modern editions.

32 The important exception is Jacoby, who famously declared that Θουρίου was the original reading. However, our manuscripts are consistent in printing Ἁλικαρνησσέος, and most modern editors leave it as it is. For a good overview of the scholarship on this issue, see Asheri, Loyd, and Corcella (2007) 72.

Thucydides provides the most revealing use of the format first name + city, one that confirms the distinction between the author as *auctor* and *actor* within a work. Thucydides, in the famous opening words of the work, introduces himself by name as an Athenian:

> Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων …
>
> Thuc. 1.1

> Thucydides the Athenian wrote up the war between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians …

Once again the structure of proper name followed by an adjective describing the author's home city appears. Thucydides, however, in contrast to his predecessors reasserts his authorship multiple times throughout the *Histories*. To mark the end of each season of war Thucydides uses the phrase "[the war] which Thucydides wrote up" (ὃν Θουκυδίδης ξυνέγραψεν).[33] Furthermore Thucydides mentions his Athenian identity once again in the work at Book 5: "and the same Thucydides the Athenian wrote about these events as well" (γέγραφε δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ὁ αὐτὸς Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος, 5.26). But this is not Thucydides' full name: despite being Athenian, he leaves out the demotic in both this and the introduction.[34] And this naming structure contrasts with Thucydides' usual practice; elsewhere he regularly introduces characters by both a first name and a patronymic.[35] However, unlike Herodotus, Thucydides was both an *auctor* and an *actor* in his *Histories*, serving as an Athenian general in the Peloponnesian war. This distinction, as it turns out, is reflected in how he names himself. When he later introduces himself as a historical figure within the work, instead of revealing himself using his ethnic, he uses his own patronymic:

> οἱ δὲ ἐναντίοι τοῖς προδιδοῦσι … πέμπουσι … ἐπὶ τὸν ἕτερον στρατηγὸν τῶν ἐπὶ Θρᾴκης, Θουκυδίδην τὸν Ὀλόρου, ὃς τάδε ξυνέγραψεν, ὄντα περὶ Θάσον …
>
> 4.104

33 See Thuc. 2.70, 2.103, 3.25, 3.88, 3.116, 4.51, 4.135, 6.7, 6.93, 7.18, 8.6, 8.60.

34 For the lack of the demotic, see Hornblower (1991) 4.

35 For Thucydides' standard naming practice, see Hornblower (1991) 4.

> and the party opposing the rebels [inside Amphipolis] … sent to the other commander in Thrace, Thucydides the son of Olorus, who wrote up these events, when he was near Thasos …[36]

Here, when he introduces himself as an agent in the action, he uses a patronymic. As Hornblower notes, in both of these instances “The distinction author/agent is precisely, even quaintly, observed …”[37] Even as he reminds the reader that the *actor* Thucydides will later become the *auctor* of this work, he marks the difference between these two roles with the use of an ethnic in one case, his patronymic in the other. Thucydides therefore clearly presents himself as an *auctor* with an ethnic designation and an *actor* with a patronymic. This confirms our thesis that the structure name + place is often associated with authorship. In this case Thucydides the Athenian describes the author of this work, while Thucydides the son of Olorus describes an actor within the work.

Finally, to return to poetry, Timotheus in two passages illustrates a complex engagement with toponyms and patronymics. The first passage occurs near the end of Timotheus’ *Persians*, in the famous section where he declares his own poetic lineage:

> πρῶτος ποικιλόμουσος Ὀρ-
> φεὺς ⟨χέλ⟩υν ἐτέκνωσεν
> υἱὸς Καλλιόπα⟨ς⏑–
> –⏓ ⟩ Πιερίαθεν·
> Τέρπανδρος δ’ ἐπὶ τῷ δέκα
> ζεῦξε μοῦσαν ἐν ᾠδαῖς·
> Λέσβος δ’ Αἰολία ν⟨ιν⟩ Ἀν-
> τίσσαι γείνατο κλεινόν·
> νῦν δὲ Τιμόθεος μέτροις
> ῥυθμοῖς τ’ ἑνδεκακρουμάτοις
> κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει,
> θησαυρὸν πολύυμνον οἴ-
> ξας Μουσᾶν θαλαμευτόν·
> Μίλητος δὲ πόλις νιν ἁ
> θρέψασ’ ἁ | δυωδεκατειχέος
> λαοῦ πρωτέος ἐξ Ἀχαιῶν.
>
> 791. 221–234 *PMG*

36 Translation based on Robert B. Strassler’s in *The Landmark Thucydides*.

37 Hornblower (1991) 5.

> Orpheus, knowing a variety of music, first begat the tortoise-shell lyre, the son of Kalliope … from Pieria. But Terpander after him yoked his muse in ten harmonies: Aeolian Lesbos gave birth to him, a glory to Antissa: but now Timotheus makes spring up the kithara in meter and rhythm striking out eleven notes, opening the much hymned, chambered store room of the Muses: but the city of Miletus raised him, a city of a people with twelve walls, foremost amongst the Achaians.

Here Timotheus sketches out a sort of poetic genealogy to his own citharodic performance. He begins with a description of Orpheus, who is identified by both a matronymic and a mention of his birthplace. The position of this "three-pronged" name at the beginning of Timotheus' genealogy suggests that he uses it as a deliberate exotic archaism. Orpheus belongs to the distant past, where gods begat the heroes of old. Timotheus continues by none too humbly contrasting his own nurturing by Miletus (Μίλητος δὲ πόλις νιν ἁ | θρέψασ', 234–235) with Terpander's Lesbian birthright (Λέσβος δ' Αἰολία ν⟨ιν⟩ Ἀν-| τίσσαι γείνατο κλεινόν, 227–228). This rivalry between Ionian and Aeolian heritage appears in the other instance of self-naming in Timotheus:

> μακάριος ἦσθα, Τιμόθε', ὅτε κᾶρυξ
> εἶπε· νικᾶι Τιμόθεος
> Μιλήσιος τὸν Κάμωνος τὸν ἰωνοκάμπταν,
> 802 *PMG*

> You were blessed, Timotheus, when the herald said, "Timotheus the Miletian has beaten the son of Camon," that Ionian melody twister.

In this passage Timotheus imitates a herald's cry announcing his victory.[38] Timotheus personally describes himself by an ethnic but describes his opponent, Phrynis, by a patronymic. As Hordern has noted, this use of a patronymic alone in an actual announcement would be unusual.[39] Similar to the *Persians* Timotheus seems to call attention to his own Ionian provenance by calling the non-Ionian Phrynis an "Ionian melody bender."[40] By naming him only by his patronymic, not only does he deny him the propagation of his first name,

38 For the form of this passage, and a useful listing of comparable passages, see Hordern (2002) 259.

39 Hordern (2002) 259. The normal practice was to name the victor by first name, patronymic, and city of origin (see Kurke (1993) 142–144).

40 See Power (2010) 341.

which, as we have seen from Theognis, is a central component of a poet's fame, but by mentioning his father, he also reminds the audience that Phrynis is in fact not Ionian.[41] Like the phrase "Ionian melody bender" this is probably intended as an insult. In fact, the close connection between the words Κάμωνος and ἰωνοκάμπταν is emphasized by the repetition of *kam* sounds in the last line of the passage.

From this overview of instances of self-naming in archaic and classical literature, it is reasonable to conclude that authors were closely associated with a certain city or place.[42] In fact, poets are so associated with a certain city or place that they can refer to themselves or their work by that place alone. The most famous instance of this is the mention of "a blind man, who dwells in rocky Chios" (τυφλὸς ἀνήρ, οἰκεῖ δὲ Χίῳ ἔνι παιπαλοέσσῃ …) in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (172). This "blind man from Chios" is of course Homer, whose persona the current rhapsodic performer inhabits in the course of his song. No doubt part of the reason why the blind man remains nameless is to facilitate reperformance by other rhapsodes.[43] Like Santa Clauses at the mall each one could claim when pressed that he is not the "real" Homer but just a stand-in.

Timothy Power has convincingly argued that early citharodic groups were organized similarly to rhapsodes. Like the Homeridae, citharodes were a traveling group of professionals who performed the poems of and claimed descent from a mythical founder, in this case Terpander.[44] And similarly to the rhapsodes, their mythical founder was frequently identified by his birthplace alone. Sappho preserves the earliest mention of the "Lesbian singer," but the phrase "after the Lesbian singer" (μετὰ Λέσβιον ᾠδόν) became proverbial.[45] This proverb

41 Power (2010) 393 n. 217 notes, as was first argued by Wilamowitz, that it is possible that Phrynis' father's name was actually Σκάμων. In this case, Timotheus shortened it for possibly comic and derogative reasons, and I would add, to add more emphasis to the alliteration. In any case, both Κάμων and Σκάμων are both well-attested Lesbian names (see *LGPN* 1. *s.v.*). They probably even in their day *sounded* Lesbian.

42 It should be noted here that Burkert (1972) 252 and n. 68 reconstructs the title of Philolaus' *On Nature* as "Philolaus of Croton says the following on nature" (⟨Φιλόλαος Κροτωνιάτας περί φύσιος ὧδε λέγει·⟩).

43 For Homer's namelessness in this passage, see Martin (2009) 90.

44 See Power (2010) 331–335.

45 See Sappho 106V = Demetr. *De eloc.* 146 Innes: "Outstanding, like the Lesbian singer to foreigners" (πέρροχος, ὡς ὄτ' ἄοιδος ὁ Λέσβιος ἀλλοδάποισιν). It appears that this comparison was directed at the groom during a song performed at a wedding. For the proverb "after the Lesbian singer," see Cratin. fr. 263 Kassel-Austin; Plut. *De Sera* 13, 558a; Eust. *Il.* 9.129 Erbse; Zen. 5.9; Hesychius s.v. Λέσβιος ᾠδός, s.v μετὰ Λέσβιον ᾠδόν. These fragments are all gathered in Gostoli T 60a–h.

was thought even in antiquity to refer to Terpander by Aristotle himself.[46] The cry "after the Lesbian singer" became so famous that it was incorporated into the rituals of the Carnean festival itself.[47] Again, we see the pressures of secondary performances exerting themselves. Any citharode who performed at the Carnea would temporarily take on the mantle and persona of Terpander himself.[48] Terpander, like Homer, was constantly resurrected and reenacted within performance.

The device of naming oneself only by an "ethnic" is also frequently used in epinician poetry. Bacchylides refers to himself as a "Cean nightingale" when he discusses his future fame: "And when someone calls out your name truthfully, he will also sing of the grace of the honey-tongued Cean nightingale …" (σὺν δ' ἀλαθ[είᾳ] καλῶν / καὶ μελιγλώσσου τις ὑμνήσει χάριν | Κηΐας ἀηδόνος, 3.95–96 Maehler). He also addresses his poetic labors as "much-famed Cean care" (εὐαίνετε Κηΐα μέριμνα, 19.11 Maehler). On several occasions Pindar also claims to drink the waters of the Dirce (a river near Thebes): "[songs] which have at last appeared next to the greatly famed Dirce" (τὰ παρ' εὐκλέϊ Δίρκᾳ χρόνῳ μὲν φάνεν, *Ol.* 10.85); "I offer them a drink of the holy water of the Dirce …" (πίσω σφε Δίρκας ἁγνὸν ὕδωρ, *Isthm.* 6.74).[49] In *Olympian 6*, Pindar constructs a genealogy between him and the Stymphalian audience through the eponymous nymph Thebe (ll. 84–86). In the same poem he asks the chorus-leader Aeneas "whether we escape by our truthful words the old insult 'Boeotian pig'" (ἀρχαῖον ὄνειδος ἀλαθέσιν | λόγοις εἰ φεύγομεν, Βοιωτίαν ὗν, ll. 89–90).[50]

Elsewhere, Pindar refers to himself and Thebes explicitly. For example, he says, "For you I come from glorious Thebes, bringing this song and the announcement of the four-horse chariot that shakes the earth" (ὔμμιν τόδε τᾶν λιπαρᾶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν φέρων | μέλος ἔρχομαι ἀγγελίαν τετραορίας ἐλελίχθονος, *Pyth.* 2.3–4). The "*sphragis*" at the end of *Pythian* 4 is also illustrative: "he would then say, Arcesilas, what a stream of ambrosial words he found, when he was recently entertained as a *xenos* at Thebes" (καί κε μυθήσαιθ', ὁποίαν, Ἀρκεσίλα, | εὗρε παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων, πρόσφατον Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς, *Pyth.* 4.298–299).[51]

46 See Eust. *Il.* 9.129 Erbse = T 60c Gostoli.

47 See especially Plut. *De Sera* 13, 558a and Eust. *Il.* 9.129 Erbse.

48 For citharodes at the Carnea imitating the persona of Terpander, see Power (2010) 331–332.

49 In frag. 198b S–M he also claims to drink the waters of the Tilphossa, a spring in Boeotia.

50 In *Isthm.* 1.1 and 7.1 Pindar also directly addresses the nymph Thebe. Also see frag. 195 S–M.

51 In addition to these other references, frag. 194 S–M may be added. The original context is lost, but it may be another self-reference, if Aristides' comments (who preserves the fragment) are correct.

Oftentimes, these mentions of Thebes, whether indirect or not, are the only indications that the *ego* of the ode is indeed Pindar.

It is striking that both Pindar and Bacchylides refuse to name themselves, both inside their epinicians and outside of them. A reason for this can be surmised: as in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the poets use the pseudo-anonymity of place-names to facilitate reperformance. Pindar and Bacchylides were most likely keenly aware of the value of secondary performances and actively shaped their odes to facilitate them.[52] This use of a place name in lieu of their own personal names, therefore, seems likely to help facilitate reperformances by non-original performers.[53] Pseudo-anonymity through mention of place allowed epinician poets to keep their poems open to reperformance by both amateur and professional performers while retaining their authorship of them. Just as was the case with Homer and Terpander, it is easier to imitate the man from Thebes or Ceos than Pindar and Bacchylides themselves.

There are exceptions, however, to the structure name + place in archaic and classical literature outside of Attic drama. The first exception can be found in Antiochus' work *On Italy*: "Antiochus the son of Xenophanes wrote up the following about Italy …" (Ἀντίοχος Ξενοφάνεος τάδε συνέγραψε περὶ Ἰταλίας, *FGrHist* 555 F 2). There are clear Near Eastern parallels for naming authors by name and patronymic. For instance, many of the prophetic books of the Old Testament begin with some mention of both the prophet's name and his father, usually with additional specification.[54] We may perhaps speculate that more early historians whose work does not survive prefaced their narratives with both a name and patronymic.

In addition to patronymics authors describe themselves also by a place name in some rare cases. This "three-pronged" form of the name has plentiful Near Eastern parallels.[55] This suggests that the "three-pronged" name, like the structure name + patronymic, was probably used more widely than our extant texts suggest, especially among Ionian writers in frequent contact with the Near East. But some extant instances of this naming structure survive. First Alcmaeon prefaces his work with both a patronymic and a place name: "Alcmaeon of Croton the son of Peirithous said the following to Brotinus,

52 For poets' awareness of how reperformances shape texts, see Woodbury (1952) 22–23; Ford (1985); Currie (2004) 54–55.

53 For a discussion of the importance of performers of Pindaric odes, as opposed to the author, see Stehle in this volume (Ch. 1).

54 See, e.g., Isa. 1.1, 2.1, 13.1; Jer. 1.1; Hos. 1.1; Joel 1.1; Zeph. 1.1; Zech. 1.1. For a good overview of the structure of these names, see the commentary on Jer. 1.1 in Meeks (1993).

55 See, e.g., Jer. 1.1; Ezek. 1.3.

Leon, and Bathyllus …" (Ἀλκμαίων Κροτωνιήτης τάδε ἔλεξε Πειρίθου υἱὸς Βροτίνῳ καὶ Λέοντι καὶ Βαθύλλῳ·, DK 24B1). The iambic poet Susarion provides another example of combining patronymic and place of origin. In the sole fragment ascribed to him, he describes himself using not only his name, patronymic, and city, but even his local village (a "demotic"): "Silence, people: Susarion the son of Philinus, from Tripodeske in Megara says the following" (ἀκούετε λεῴ· Σουσαρίων λέγει τάδε | υἱὸς Φιλίνου Μεγαρόθεν Τριποδίσκιος, West *IEG*^{2}).[56] And finally, if a citation from Lucian is indeed a representative parody of his work, Ctesias in his *Indica* may have introduced himself by both a patronymic and an ethnic: "… like Ctesias the son of Ctesiochus from Cnidos, who wrote about the lands around India …" (⟨ὧν⟩ Κτησίας ὁ Κτησιόχου ὁ Κνίδιος, ὃς συνέγραψεν περὶ τῆς Ἰνδῶν χώρας, Luc. *Ver. hist.* 1.3).[57] And that is all the evidence, at least that is known to me, of poets naming themselves or being cited by patronymics.[58]

A more general exception to this relative disuse of patronymics could be found in rhapsodic and citharodic groups. On the surface, the Homeridae, the rhapsodic group that claimed descent from Homer, seems to be an exception to this general rule. And as we discussed earlier, it is likely that citharodic groups were organized in a similar manner to rhapsodes. Taken together, these two groups seem to provide a strong exception to the trend that I have identified, the general disdain of authors towards using genealogical terms. However, I would dispute that either of these two groups were "authors," at least according to the parameters established above. As we defined "authorship," authors

56 If, of course, we assume Susarion was an iambic poet: see West (1974) 183–184 for a discussion of the evidence. His conclusion is that "as it is, the fragment manifestly belongs to the genus iambus." For Near Eastern precedents to the act of self-naming in this fragment, see Corcella (1996) 299.

57 See Marincola (1997) 273 n. 9. Fehling (1975) 65 believes the citation to be genuine.

58 This, however, hasn't stopped other scholars from creating more. It has been suggested that Heraclitus fragment DK 22 B 1 originally began with the words "Heraclitus the son of Bloson the Ephesian says the following:" (⟨Ἡράκλειτος Βλόσωνος Ἐφέσιος τάδε λέγει·⟩). For more information about the history of this emendation, see the *apparatus criticus* to DK 22 B 1 and West (1971) 9. West on the same page also hypothesizes that Pherecydes' work began with the tag "⟨Pherecydes the Syrian said the following, the son of Babys⟩" (⟨Φερεκύδης Σύριος τάδε ἔλεξε Βάβυος υἱός⟩). Also in the case of the multi-talented philosopher/poet Ion of Chios some scholars have restored his name to the beginning of one of his extant fragments: "⟨Ion of Chios says the following:⟩, and this is the beginning of his account …" (⟨Ἴων Χῖος τάδε λέγει⟩· ἀρχὴ δέ μοι τοῦ λόγου·) (DK 36 B 1). In both the cases of Ion and Heraclitus a δέ at the beginning of the extant opening of the fragment does seem to suggest that some sort of "tag" went before, but there is no evidence as to what form it took. In all of these cases Marincola (1997) 272 n. 5 rightly urges caution.

are figures to whom a text is attributed. This is particularly *not the case* with rhapsodes and citharodes, who explicitly claimed not to perform their own songs, but the songs of their respective founders. As the various *vitae* of Homer make clear, Homer himself was considered the clear "owner" of the epic poems attributed to him, so much so that the theft of his poems or the giving of them as wedding gifts are presented as explanations for these poems becoming associated with other authors.[59] In fact, much of the biographical lore we possess about Homer and Terpander was probably disseminated in the rhapsodes' and citharodes' own performances.[60] Therefore, we probably should consider rhapsodes and citharodes less "authors" in their own right, and more as secondary performers and interpreters of poetry.[61] This is not to deny the creativity involved in rhapsodic performance, or the possibility that they themselves performed original songs.[62] It is to emphasize that they preferred to attribute these songs to other "author" figures. And it also serves as an excellent lesson that ideas of authorship do not always overlap with creativity and originality. One can create original content and still not be considered an "author."

To briefly summarize the results so far, it seems that the most popular way to refer to authors is simply by their first name. However, in many distinct and conspicuous cases, the author's first name is augmented by his home city. Many of these instances of name + city/place, probably not coincidentally, count amongst the most explicit statements of authorship in archaic and classical Greek literature outside of Attic drama. The association between poet and place is so strong that at times a place name can become representative of the poet himself. There are indeed exceptions, with authors identifying themselves by a name + patronym or even name + patronym + toponym, but these instances are relatively rare.

How do we explain this preference for specifying place rather than patronym in such authorial statements? It first should be noted that the very construction of name + place downplays poets' and other authors' local and genealogical ties to the community. The practices of authorial naming seem to emphasize the mere fact that they are *from* a certain place without stressing any other bio-

59 For poems as presents, see Proclus *Chrestomathy* 1.5 = 5.5 in West (2003) (cf. Callim. Epigr. LV Gow-Page); for the theft of a poem of Homer, see Ps. Hdt. 16 = 2.16 West.

60 For the dissemination of Terpander's *vita* by citharodes, see Power (2010) 331. For Homer, see Ford (2002) 71. We see such biographical information conveyed in *Hymn. Hom. Apo.* 172–173.

61 Ford (2002) 68–72 discusses how rhapsodes were the first "critics" of the poems they themselves performed.

62 For the creativity of rhapsodic performances, see Collins (2001).

logical or genealogical ties to their community.[63] Furthermore, I would argue that the place name is a key part of a poet's persona. Being from a certain place becomes a component of the author's personality that informs the work itself. This emphasis on place over family therefore has important implications for the persona of the ancient author. In modern, Western discourse, the structure first name + patronymic implies a unique biological individual, singular in his creative genius.[64] In Greek practice, the opposite occurs: the *place* that an author comes from becomes emphasized, while family names are often relegated to the comments of scholiasts. Authors need to be from *somewhere*. Rather than emphasizing the individuality of a particular author, it emphasizes his place on a mental map of Greece. Not only does it place him in a specific geographical and political unit, but it also emphasizes his place within a particular city-state's traditions. The place name specifies what *polis* and what mythological and cultural traditions a poet belongs to.

The place-name, therefore, heightens the poet's claims to traditionality and suggests that his poetry has a specific, epichoric vantage point. The place name signals more than just where an author is from, but rather his place within the combined epichoric traditions of the various Greek city-states. By declaring themselves from a certain city-state, authors, and by extension poets, allow audiences to "place" them both geographically and culturally. An audience who hears an author or poet from Halicarnassus, Megara, or Chios knows what traditions he or she represents. The construction first name + city, therefore, immediately marks a poetic product as available for export, ready to be consumed by audiences in a wide variety of locales. Authors' and poets' practices of self-naming assume "panhellenic" performance abroad rather than "epichoric" performance at home.[65]

63 It is striking, that when the secondary tradition does give poets an extended genealogy, they are often descended from *other poets*. See, e.g., Stesichorus' supposed descent from Hesiod (T1 Campbell); for a discussion of genealogies of poets as literary theories about genres, see Beecroft (2010) 72–84.

64 For the influence of Lockian and other realistic ideas of individuality on the development of the modern novel, see the dated but still essential study of Watt (1957) 18–21. The pages cited here also contain an interesting discussion of the effect of realism on proper names within the novelistic form.

65 See also Bakker in this volume (Ch. 5) on the "international" and panhellenic potential for an author's name being associated with a specific polis.

Bibliography

Asheri, D., A. Lloyd, and A. Corcella. 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus, Books I–IV*, ed. O. Murray and A. Moreno et al. Oxford.

Barthes, R. 1977. "The Death of the Author." In *Image Music Text*. Tr. S. Heath, 142–148. London.

Beecroft, A. 2010. *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China: Patterns of Literary Circulation*. Cambridge.

Bertelli, L. 2001. "Hecataeus: From Genealogy to Historiography." In *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, ed. N. Luraghi, 67–94. Oxford.

Burkert, W. 1972. *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*. Tr. Edwin L. Minar Jr. Cambridge, MA.

Corcella, A. 1996. "Ecateo Di Mileto Cosi Dice." *Quaderni di storia* 43: 295–301.

Currie, B. 2004. "Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes." In *Oral Performance and its Context*, ed. C.J. Mackie, 49–69. Leiden.

Detienne, M. 1986. *The Creation of Mythology*. Tr. M. Cook. Chicago.

Dickey, E. 1996. *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford.

Erne, L. 2003. *Shakespeare As A Literary Dramatist*. Cambridge.

Fehling, D. 1975. "Zur Funktion und Formgeschichte des Proömiums in der älteren griechischen Prosa." In *Δώρημα: Hans Diller Zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. S. Vourreris and A. Skiadas, 61–75. Athens.

Ford, A. 1985. "The Seal of Theognis." In *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and Polis*, ed. J. Figueira and G. Nagy, 82–95. Baltimore.

Ford, A. 2002. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton.

Finkelberg, M. 2011. *The Homer Encyclopedia*, three volumes. Malden, MA.

Foucault, M. 2001 [1969]. "What is an Author?" Tr. D.F. Bouchard and S. Simon, in *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, ed. V.B. Leitch, 1622–1636. New York.

Gerstner, D.A. 2003. "The Practices of Authorship." In *Authorship and Film*, ed. D.A. Gerstner and J. Staiger, 3–25. New York.

Gostoli, A. 1990. *Terpander*. Rome.

Hornblower, S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides: Volume 1, Books I–III*. Oxford.

Hornblower, S., and E. Matthews. 2000. *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence*. Oxford.

Hordern, J.H. 2002. *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*. Oxford.

Hubbard, T. 2007. "Theognis' *Sphrêgis*: Aristocratic Speech and the Paradoxes of Writing." In *Politics of Orality*, ed. C. Cooper, 193–215. Leiden.

Kael, P. 1963. "Circles and Squares." *Film Quarterly* 16: 12–26.

Kurke, L. 1993. "The Economy of Kudos." In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*, ed. C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, 131–163. Cambridge.

Marincola, J. 1997. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge.

Marincola, J. 2006. "Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past." In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, ed. C. Dewald and J. Marincola, 13–28. Cambridge.

Martin, R.P. 2009. "Read on Arrival." In *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality, and Pan-Hellenism*, ed. R. Hunter and I.C. Rutherford, 80–104. Cambridge.

Meeks, W., et al. 1993. *The Harper Collins Study Bible*. London.

Most, G., ed. 2006. *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, and Testimonia*. Cambridge, MA.

Nagy, G. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore.

Nagy, G. 1990. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.

Nagy, G. 1996. *Homeric Questions*. Austin.

Nehamas, A. 1986. "What an Author Is." *The Journal of Philosophy* 83: 685–691.

Pearson, L. 1939. *Early Ionian Historians*. Oxford.

Power, T. 2010. *The Culture of Kitharôidia*. Washington.

Renehan, R. 1980. "Review Article: Progress in Hesiod." *CP* 75: 339–358.

Stoddard, K. 2004. *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod*. Leiden.

Strassler, R.B., ed. 1996. *The Landmark Thucydides*. New York.

Svenbro, J. 1988. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. Tr. J. Lloyd. Ithaca.

Watt, I. 1957. *The Rise of the Novel*. Berkeley.

West, M.L. 1966. *Theogony*. Oxford.

West, M.L. 1971. *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*. Oxford.

West, M.L. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin.

West, M.L. 1999. "The Invention of Homer." *CQ* 49: 364–382.

West, M.L. 2003. *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*. Cambridge, MA.

Woodbury, L. 1952. "The Seal of Theognis." In *Studies in Honour of Gilbert Norwood*, ed. M.E. White, 20–41. Toronto.

CHAPTER 5

Trust and Fame: The Seal of Theognis

Egbert J. Bakker

> "The author is the principle of thrift in the proliferation of meaning. (…) The author is not an indefinite source of significations which fill a work; the author does not precede the works, he is a certain functional principle by which, in our culture, one limits, excludes, and chooses; in short, by which one impedes the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of fiction."
>
> FOUCAULT [1979] 159

Michel Foucault's concept of the "author function" places the fictional or poetic work in a universe ruled by juridical forces, turning producers into owners and placing restrictions on the way in which literature is consumed. The "author" sits at the nexus of such legal concepts as copyrights and the property-theft we call plagiarism. "Author" is also historically determined: Foucault associates the "author" with literature as a *product*, a matter of "goods," a developmental stage he distinguishes from the time when discourses were things done, acts.[1] This sets up archaic and classical Greek poetry as a challenge to his theory, since in the song culture of the archaic Greek polis discourses (songs, poems) were exactly that: things done, acts; and yet the world of the song culture is full of authors. Are these all principles of thrift? The Greek world did not know copyright, nor plagiarism as we understand it, but isn't the assignment of a composition to a maker, a *poiētēs*, a matter of authoring, authenticating, it, and therefore a matter of exclusion?

In addition, beginning with Hesiod's *Theogony*, compositions may be "signed," enacting their own author-ity through the insertion of a proper name, an "intradiscursive" possibility that Foucault does not consider.[2] Such explicit

1 Foucault [1979] 148.
2 Calame (2004) 11–13.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_007

self-assertions pose particular problems, not just in light of Foucault's ideas, but also, and more importantly, in the context of the transmission and reception (that is: performance) of archaic Greek poetry. Is the proper name the self-assertion of a real poet/singer performing in a specific time and place, or is it meant to mark the song's composer precisely in times and places other than that of the original composition and performance? And if so, how do the performers in those places relate to the author's name? In other words, how is authorship construed when a poem is performed by someone other than its original poet in a setting that is presumably unknown to him? And will the performance of the name authenticate the poem, setting it off from less authentic, even spurious, compositions?

This chapter will look at a body of poetry that attaches great importance to such questions: the collection of sympotic elegiac songs that goes under the authorial label of "Theognis," Theognis of Megara, to be precise. The collection is heterogeneous, and most students of archaic Greek song agree that it contains poems of varied provenance. But a scholarly consensus holds that there is an original core of the collection that goes back ultimately to a historical poet Theognis, who was active in archaic Megara in turbulent times.[3] He vents his anger to his young friend Kurnos—at least that is how we commonly interpret the vocative Κύρνε that occurs in numerous fragments: Kurnos never becomes nominative—about a community in which trust has broken down completely; in which social mobility has blurred the boundaries between "noble" and "base;" and in which a money-based elite has taken control of the polis, at the painful cost of the poet's fortune and estate. "Kurnos" is the recipient of precious advice on how to behave under these dire circumstances.

The question is whether we should read this poetry as a collection of historical documents referring to a particular period in the history of a particular polis, expressing the feelings of a single individual and addressed to a particular person. The short answer, to be elaborated on in this contribution, is no. If it were, we would not have the collection that we have. The mentality that comes out of the fragments is not an indignant reaction to what modern historians believe is reasonable to assume was happening in this particular archaic Greek polis at a particular moment in its history. Megara is less important as a place *about* which things are said or sung than as placeholder for the name of the songs' putative author. Something in these elegiac songs is so typical that it triggers in their audience the recognition that their author is Theognis of Megara:

3 On the history of the "*sylloge*," West (1974); Bowie (1979).

ὧδε δὲ πᾶς τις ἐρεῖ· "Θεύγνιδος ἐστιν ἔπη
τοῦ Μεγαρέως·" πάντας δὲ κατ᾽ ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός.
Thgn. 22–23

And so will everyone speak: "It's the lines of Theognis
of Megara;" I <will be> named among all men.

We will soon look at the programmatic poem in which these lines occur in its entirety and ask what precisely it is that makes people say what the poem says they will. Here we simply notice that the point of the utterance is that the song is performed *outside of Megara*: Theognis is what he is precisely by not being confined to any local Megarian context; his name (Θεύγνιδος) and toponym (Μεγαρέως) are pointedly pronounced (and hence textually transmitted) in "international" Ionic, the language of *epos*—or, alternatively, an Ionic speaker is quoted as speaking in his own local dialect.[4] The poetic utterance of the name of Theognis thus presents him as an author who has the intention to be relevant to all Greeks (notice the future verb ἐρεῖ), a claim that recurs in another programmatic song, which we will equally study later in its entirety:

σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ πτέρ᾽ ἔδωκα, σὺν οἷσ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀπείρονα πόντον
πωτήσῃ, κατὰ γῆν πᾶσαν ἀειρόμενος
(…)
Κύρνε, καθ᾽ Ἑλλάδα γῆν στρωφώμενος, ἠδ᾽ ἀνὰ νήσους
ἰχθυόεντα περῶν πόντον ἐπ᾽ ἀτρύγετον,
Thgn. 237–238; 247–248

To you I have given wings, with which to the boundless sea
you will fly, lifted over the entire earth,
(…)
Kúrne, roaming all over the land of Hellas and through the islands,
crossing the barren sea rich in fish,

We might suppose that Megara and its social conflicts will be sung about in all these faraway places,[5] but as it happens there is only one—oblique—reference specifically to Megara in the corpus:

4 On toponyms as part of an poet's identity as author, see Boterf (Chapter 4) in this volume. Notice that whereas Θεύγνιδος is deliberately Ionic, ἔπη is unmistakably Attic (Μεγαρέως can be either).

5 For a discussion of sixth-century Megarian politics as backdrop for Theognis' poetry, see

Φοῖβε ἄναξ, αὐτὸς μὲν ἐπύργωσας πόλιν ἄκρην,
    Ἀλκαθόῳ Πέλοπος παιδὶ χαριζόμενος
αὐτὸς δὲ στρατὸν ὑβριστὴν Μήδων ἀπέρυκε
    τῆσδε πόλευς, ἵνα σοι λαοὶ ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ
ἦρος ἐπερχομένου κλειτὰς πέμπωσ' ἑκατόμβας
    τερπόμενοι κιθάρῃ καὶ ἐρατῇ θαλίῃ
παιάνων τε χοροῖσ' ἰαχῇσί τε σὸν περὶ βωμόν·
    ἦ γὰρ ἔγωγε δέδοικ' ἀφραδίην ἐσορῶν
καὶ στάσιν Ἑλλήνων λαοφθόρον. ἀλλὰ σύ, Φοῖβε,
    ἵλαος ἡμετέρην **τήνδε** φύλασσε **πόλιν**.

Thgn. 773–782

Lord Phoebus, you yourself have fortified this acropolis,
    as a favor to Alkathoos the son of Pelops.
Now yourself ward off the Medes' violent army
    from this polis, so that its people in festive spirit can send you
famed hekatombs in procession when the spring comes,
    rejoicing in the kithara and the lovely festival,
and in the Paeans and shouts of choruses, all around your altar.
    I myself am fearful when looking at the mindlessness
and people-destroying discord of the Greeks. But you, Phoibos,
    be propitious and guard *this polis here*.

This prayer locates itself with precision in space and time: Apollo's favor to Alkathoos points to Megara and the reference to the Medes' wanton army to 480 BCE (a point in time well beyond the life span of the traditional Megarian poet).[6] This means that the deictic indications (776 τῆσδε πόλευς, 782 τήνδε … πόλιν 'this polis here') lock in Megara at this particular moment and that any subsequent renderings of this song are reperformances with reference to an original occasion.

Usually Theognis is less easy to pin down, however. This brings us to a feature of the poetics of performance that is key to the panhellenic aspirations and distribution of the Theognidean corpus.

Lane Fox (2000) 40–45, who is, however, sensitive to the possibility that Theognidean elegy is applicable to other times and places. See also Van Wees (2000).

6 For Alkathoos and the walls of Megara, cf. Paus. 1.41.6.

Prospective Indexicality

The prayer to Apollo in Megara is not the only reference to *stasis* and strife in Theognis. Nor is "this polis here" as a way of indicating a song's setting confined to the prayer to Apollo just quoted:

Κύρνε, κύει **πόλις ἥδε**, δέδοικα δὲ μὴ τέκῃ ἄνδρα
εὐθυντῆρα κακῆς ὕβριος ἡμετέρης
(…)
ἐκ τῶν γὰρ στάσιες τε καὶ ἔμφυλοι φόνοι ἀνδρῶν
μούναρχοί τε· **πόλει** μήποτε **τῆδε** ἅδοι
Thgn. 39–40; 51–52

Kúrne, this polis here is in labor, and I fear lest it give birth to a man
who will be the corrector of this bad hubris of ours
(…)
From these things come civil unrest and manslaughter within the *phyle*
As well as single rulers; may this never please *this polis here*

Κύρνε, πόλις μὲν ἔθ᾽ **ἥδε πόλις**, λαοὶ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι
Thgn. 53

Kúrne, this polis here is still a polis, yet clearly the people have changed.

Never in the two songs from which I just quoted is there any direct or indirect reference to Megara or to a specific point in time. Such a reference may or may not have been intended or taken for granted; but even if it is, special care has been taken to minimize its interfering with subsequent performances, to the point where such performances merge with the original performance, if there ever was any. Another way of saying this is that the voice of the songs is meant to be generic enough to ensure that the songs' performers do not reenact or impersonate any original voice of Theognis addressing his Kurnos. The song's voice is their own. The symposiast singing a Theognis song is not "playing" or reenacting an original Theognis by way of *mimesis*; instead, he *becomes* Theognis; his voice is not mimetic, but *indexical*.

In discourse linguistics, *indexicality* is a property of statements that contain so-called *indexicals*, demonstrative or deictic elements like "I," "you," "now," "here," "this," "that," etc. The referentiality of such elements is very different from that of normal referential expressions, such as nouns; they come to designate anything or anyone specific only in the concrete context of their utterance,

when the "I" is the speaker that the addressee is actually listening to, the "now" the actual moment when the verbal transaction takes place, and the "here" the actual place of the speech event. So utterances like "I like this city," or "Tell me what you think!" are indexical because the "I," the "you," and the "this city" are meaningful only in the context in which the utterance takes place. Now when a given statement is not only uttered or performed (as in any ordinary conversation or narration), but also *composed in order to be performed* (which means in practice that it is meant to be *re*performed), the indexicality of the phrase, its inbuilt "hereness" and "nowness" is, as I call it, *projected.* Whoever performs it will complement its referentiality with respect to the new context of utterance. I propose "projected indexicality" as an important feature of panhellenic poetics, in which poems and performances are meant to travel in time and place, thus extending, and projecting, the indexicality of their constitutive utterances.

A simple way to illustrate the nature of the indexical voice as opposed to the mimetic voice comes from the narratology of Homeric performance: we can oppose the voice of Homer the narrator to that of Achilles or other characters in a performance of the *Iliad.* Achilles' here and now, to be expressed in deictics, is a reality of another time and place that is mimetically represented when a performer plays the hero's role in performance. Homer's here and now, on the other hand, most explicitly expressed in Muse invocations (e.g., ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι 'sing *now to me*, Muses', *Il.* 2.484, etc.), is the here and now of the performance itself, *any* performance, not the *mimesis*, re-enactment, of Homer's original moment of composition.[7]

All this is to say that in Theognis the referent of the deictic phrase ἥδε πόλις 'this polis here' is not necessarily Megara, but, in a prospectively indexical way, whatever city the song is sung in (except for 776 and 782 in the prayer to Apollo cited above). The political situation in the poetry is specific enough to be recognized as a certain type: we are told of *stasis* in the city because of hubris of the *kakoí,* which may lead to tyranny; or there is the problem of the reversal of class power relations between the *kakoí* and the *esthloí* and the breakdown of political structure. But the descriptions offered do not seem to be specific *enough* to be applicable to one particular city only; the descriptions of the demise of aristocratic power and the danger of tyranny and *stasis* apply to a whole range of cities, so that the poem can travel from city to city and be maximally meaningful each time without having to change its exact wording.

Now if "this city" is prospectively indexical, and if each symposiast singing in his particular setting becomes "Theognis," then the marker of the poetry's

7 See also Bakker (2009) 122–125; cf. Bakker (2005) 174–175.

addressee, *Kúrne*—and all vocatives are indexical—is the most striking prospectively indexical item in the singing of Theognis songs. Just as "this city" has been taken to refer to Megara, the vocative has since antiquity been commonly assumed to be the address of the poet's *erōmenos*. But just like the city, the boy remains generic and unspecific. There is not much personal interaction with the addressee inscribed into the songs other than that he is the recipient of wisdom and advice.[8] But as a prospectively indexical item the vocative is of central importance for Theognis.

Interpreting the Seal

The self-revelation of the songs' author as "Theognis of Megara" is commonly referred to as a *sphragis*; in fact, it is agreed to be *the sphragis*, in view of the prominent use of the term (in its Ionic pronunciation) in the lines just preceding the utterance of Theognis' name. It remains to be seen, however, whether this *sphrēgís* is the same thing as the *sphragis* of the literary tradition.[9] The *sphrēgís* is the enigmatic centerpiece of the poem that according to many scholars stood at the beginning of the original collection of Theognidean poetry:[10]

Κύρνε, σοφιζομένῳ μὲν ἐμοὶ σφρηγὶς ἐπικείσθω
τοῖσδ' ἔπεσιν, λήσει δ' οὔποτε κλεπτόμενα,
οὐδέ τις ἀλλάξει κάκιον τοὐσθλοῦ παρεόντος·
ὧδε δὲ πᾶς τις ἐρεῖ· "Θεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη
τοῦ Μεγαρέως"· πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός.

8 A rare exception is Thgn. 819–820, where συναμφοτέρους is to be understood in an interactive sense ("both of us"). There are also cases of φίλε Κύρνε (181, 539, 1102a). On the lack of second-person orientation, see Fain 2006.

9 As specified in Pollux, *Onom.* 4.66 (the seven parts of the citharodic nomos, the penultimate of which is the σφραγίς) and evidenced in Timotheus' *Persae* (PMG 791.229). See Edmunds (1997) 30–31; Calame 2004: 13–15.

10 E.g., Steffen (1968) 12–23; West (1974) 42; Bowie (1997) 62; Faraone (2008) 57. The poem's ending is variously placed at l. 26, at l. 28 (as here), and at l. 30 and 38. The ending at l. 28 is attractive, because it allows for a balanced pair of elegiac stanzas (19–28; 29–38: Faraone (2008) 57–60) and the structure of the poem (desirable situation (universal renown) in the future, less desirable situation (no universal political acceptance) in the present) corresponds with the putative final poem of the collection (237–254), which displays the same organization, but in reversed form; see below. Full discussion of the poem and the question in Selle (2008) 289–311 and Colesanti (2011) 241–262 with extensive coverage of the scholarship.

ἀστοῖσιν δ' οὔπω πᾶσιν ἀδεῖν δύναμαι·
οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, Πολυπαΐδη· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς
οὔθ' ὕων πάντεσσ' ἀνδάνει οὔτ' ἀνέχων.
σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ εὖ φρονέων ὑποθήσομαι, οἷά περ αὐτός,
Κύρν', ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν παῖς ἔτ' ἐὼν ἔμαθον·
Thgn. 19–28

Kurne: let ⟨hereby⟩ a *sphrēgís* be placed by me, as I perform my trick,
in/with these very lines; ⟨then⟩ they can be stolen, but that will never go unnoticed,
nor will anyone change them for the worse with the excellent one[/element] present;
and so will everyone speak: “It’s the lines of Theognis
of Megara;” I ⟨will be⟩ named among all men.
But the citizens, I am not yet able to please them all ⟨politically⟩;
that is nothing surprising, son of Polypaos! For not even Zeus,
neither in raining nor in holding back, can please all the people.
But to you I will ⟨now⟩ with the best intentions offer advice such as I myself,
Kúrne, have learned from the noble ones when still a boy.

A number of questions immediately present themselves here: What is meant by “*sphrēgís*”? What does it mean for a *sphrēgís* to be “placed upon” *epea*? And what in fact *is* the *sphrēgís*? How does it manifest itself in our received text of the Theognidea?

The first question can be answered in a number of ways. Perhaps most intuitively, in connection with the revelation of the name, *sphrēgís* has been thought of as denoting the idea of a signet or label identifying an owner or a maker.[11] A natural consequence of this is to see the name “Theognis” as the *sphrēgís*, placing on the songs the stamp of ownership or authorship.[12] This interpretation is in line with once very common ideas about the rise of personality and authorial self-awareness in an archaic age that is seen as “post-epic:” a poet shows authorial awareness in revealing himself as creator and owner of the work. But although it is clear that the revelation of the name is important, it does not seem right to see the name “Theognis of Megara” itself as

11 E.g., Hdt. 3.41 (Polycrates’ ring).

12 A venerable list of proponents, including: Welcker (1826) cxxi, Reitzenstein (1970) 266–267, Kroll (1936) 48–87, and van Groningen (1966) 19; a much longer list in Selle (2008) 290 n. 251.

the seal, since in the text the name is part of an embedded utterance: it occurs in the listeners' "quoted" *reaction* to the seal; the name is not necessarily the seal itself. It may well be that those who propose to see the name "Theognis" as the *sphrēgís* have been influenced too much by the literary notion of "*sphragis*" mentioned earlier.

Another understanding of *sphrēgís* is to see it as a lock, a seal intended to detect unauthorized access to someone's property, on the model of technology preventing tampering with the contents of jars or other vessels (some scholars have even suggested that the *sphrēgís* is a physical seal on a scroll).[13] Authorship in the sense of rightful ownership is not so much at stake in this vision as *false* or stolen authorship, plagiarism. If one favors this line of thought, then it might become natural to take the *sphrēgís* to be the vocative Κύρνε, a line of approach followed by many in the past.[14] The presence of Κύρν(ε) in a poem would be proof of its authenticity and a safeguard against literary theft.

To this interpretation it has been objected that in and of itself the vocative cannot prevent plagiarism or tampering, because it would be possible to find trochaic words to replace the name. This has happened in fact: twice we have in our collection a fluctuation between Κύρνε and θυμέ, on which further below.[15] This perhaps explains why the most recent commentators have moved away from personal authorship or textual purity as interpretation of the seal. In a recent paper, Lowell Edmunds has argued that the seal "is the political and ethical character of the poetry," a kind of personal style so to speak; and Andrew Ford holds that "the seal of Theognis had as its prime function the codification and authorization of a body of gnomological poetry as representing the accepted standards and values of the *agathoí*. The name of Theognis guarantees not the origin of the *epē* but their homogeneous political character and their aristocratic provenience."[16] That is, Ford and Edmunds have moved away from author- or ownership and shifted attention to the *work* as such.

This is a good basis from which to make further explorations, especially when we take "work" in a wider sense than is usually done. A poem written by a poet is not complete as work until it is sung by a symposiast at a symposium. And it is in the symposium that the seal has its proper place.

13 Physical seal: Young (1961) x; ownership: Woodbury (1952).

14 Perhaps most prominently Jacoby [1972] 334, but see the complete list in Selle (2008) 291n254.

15 Thgn. 213–214 and 1071–1072; 355–356 and 1029–1030; cf. Steffen (1968) 15.

16 Edmunds (1997) 37; Ford (1985) 89, resp.

Transmission and Instruction

The idea presented here is that the seal is Κύρνε, but unlike all those who have preceded me in taking this line I see the *sphrēgís* as more than a mere textual item. The *sphrēgís* is a prospectively indexical element, the "you" addressed by the indexical voice of Theognis. Κύρνε is a vocative, and vocatives are about "you," but we don't encounter interactive, second-person-oriented elements until the end of the poem: "I will (now) offer you instruction" (σοὶ … ὑποθήσομαι), the speaker sings, adding an indication of his disposition: εὖ φρονέων (or εὐφρονέων), the Homeric way of referring to well-intentioned advice.[17] The speaker claims to offer exactly the same instruction that he himself once received when he was young, pointedly juxtaposing "self" and Κύρνε (27–28 οἷά περ αὐτὸς || Κύρν').

This suggests that in the diachronic perspective of the transmission of wisdom from generation to generation Κύρν(ε) designates both the song's speaker and its listener. Wisdom has to be passed on exactly as it was once received, and this desire for fixity and stability is what creates the need for a "seal." The seal is neither the self-revelation of an individual poet, nor the claim to ownership and the prevention of theft; it stems from a desire to keep things exactly as they are. For this to happen, it is important that the text, the poems' wording, not be altered or compromised, but the text is as such no more than the tip of an iceberg. The song is more than mere words, and the song is "right" not only when its singer has all the words right, but also when the audience is right. Κύρνε must be present for things to remain what they were before, which means that the vocative must be present in the song's text and that the right listener must be present in the symposium, where the song is sung.

This double nature of the seal is expressed with admirable economy in the third line of the programmatic *sphrēgís* song,

> οὐδέ τις ἀλλάξει κάκιον τοὐσθλοῦ παρεόντος·
> Thgn. 21

Most translations are based on the idea of change by replacement of textual items (e.g., "and no one will substitute something inferior for the *esthlón* [genuine] thing that is there"[18]). The ἐσθλόν 'noble element' could then be the

17 In the sympotic context we may also think of an association with the pleasure (εὐφροσύνη) of wine; e.g., Thgn. 765–766 and particularly, in an erotic-didactic context, 1284.

18 Ford (1985) 82.

sphrēgís Κύρνε. It would seem, then, that "decomposition" and "recomposition" of the poems is being prevented. But παρεῖναι can equally, and perhaps more naturally, apply to the physical presence of persons. This might suggest a reading of the phrase τοὐσθλοῦ παρεόντος as an absolute genitive with conditional force: "and no one will change them for the worse provided the *esthlós* one is present."[19] The element Κύρνε, which as a vocative is indexical, becomes prospectively indexical as the *sphrēgís*: it will address the right audience for any of the poetry's performances. The *sphrēgís* "seals" the audience just as much as it seals the poetry. It signifies the right words uttered by the right singer to the right addressee.[20]

Setting the Seal

The *sphrēgís* song, as indicated earlier (n. 10), can be seen as programmatic, perhaps placed at the head of the original collection. This means that not only does it introduce the seal, or state the need for the seal; it sets the seal. By performing the poem the singer enacts the *sphrēgís*. Let us return to the song's beginning:

> Κύρνε σοφιζομένῳ μὲν ἐμοὶ σφρηγὶς ἐπικείσθω
> τοίσδ' ἔπεσιν
> Thgn. 19–20

> Kurnos, let a seal be placed by me as I am being clever,
> on these very words.

Beyond being an address in the sense just explicated, this is a programmatic moment of encoding. The name Κύρνε is not only a vocative, but also, in a less obvious, but "clever" second reading, the subject of ἐπικείσθω, with σφρηγίς as predicative modifier, so that we could translate as follows:

> "Κύρνε," let ⟨this element⟩ ⟨hereby⟩ be placed by me as a *sphrēgís* as I play my trick,
> on these very words.

19 So also Svenbro (1976) 85.

20 The adjective ἐσθλός collapses the distinctions between "man," "word," "thought," etc., cf. 35 ἐσθλῶν μὲν γὰρ ἄπ' ἐσθλὰ μαθήσεαι.

The vocative stands outside of the prosodic domain of μέν that begins with σοφιζομένῳ, thus acting as "frame" for the sentence to follow.[21] The participle σοφιζομένῳ that modifies the speaker's act tends to be taken by modern scholars either in the sense of art, professional poetic skill ("as I practice my art, *sophiē* [i.e., poetry][22])" or in the ethical sense of "wisdom." But it seems preferable to interpret the participle as a characterization of the placement of the seal as a "trick," the encoding of a *double entendre*.[23]

Crucial is also the imperative ἐπικείσθω in a *performative* sense, as conveyed by "hereby" in the translation. In other words, what we are witnessing here is not a reference to the placement of a seal, nor the statement of the need for a seal to be placed,[24] but *the placement of the seal itself*. The verb is "performative" in the strict sense in which the term is used in speech-act theory:[25] uttering the verb is performing the action expressed by it. "Let a line be set (κείσθω)" or "let a circle be drawn (γεγράφθω)," says the mathematical writer, not ordering anyone to do this, but focusing on the mathematical object itself and putting it into place with his very words.[26] And when Herodotus says "With regard to the Nile, let so much have been said" (τοσαῦτα εἰρήσθω, Hdt. 2.14), he is not saying that the discourse on the Nile should stop; he marks the end of the discussion.[27]

The idea of "sealing" means, and is meant to be, that the "sealed" result of the operation will be available, unaltered, to people in the future. The songs of Theognis need a seal because they are fluid, but strive for a permanency that comes naturally to messages that are inscribed.[28] Contracts or agreed upon

---

21 On frames in this sense, see Bakker (1997) 86–122. The treatment of the vocative here has been rejected by Campbell (1982) 349: "to print Κύρνε in quotation marks is little short of cheating and leaves μέν in an intolerable position;" cf. Selle (2008) 292. This is untrue: enclitic particles may seemingly violate Wackernagel's Law (which specifies that enclitics gravitate to the second place in their clause) in being placed in the third (or even fourth) position in their clause, when the first element stands as "theme" outside the syntactic domain of the enclitic. See Ruijgh (1990), Bakker (1997) 101. Within the Theognidean corpus another example is v. 271.

22 With Hes. *W&D* 649 (οὔτε τι ναυτιλίης σεσοφισμένος) invariably being quoted.

23 See the bibliography in Selle 2008: 294n264 for earlier readings along these lines.

24 As in West's (1974) 149 "σφρηγὶς ἐπικείσθω will mean'it had better be locked up, it is the sort people will want to steal'."

25 Austin (1975) 4–5.

26 E.g., Eucl. *El.* 1.3; Archim. *De Lin. Spir.* 2.21; cf. Schironi (2010) 349.

27 Within Theognis there is ᾐνίχθω (681), meaning not that something needs to be said in a riddling way, but marking what has been said (an allegory of the polis as a ship) as a riddle.

28 On the seal with regard to writing, see also Pratt (1995); Hubbard (2007).

privileges are drawn up in stone or bronze when the agreement is meant to apply beyond the beneficiary's life to his descendants into the future. The Theognidean collection, too, through its "seal," aims at a permanency that can be conceived of in terms of monumentality. In fact, the very word for the placing of the seal, ἐπικείσθω, carries monumental (or sepulchral) overtones in its association with the statue or stele that is "placed upon" the grave mound.[29] The epigram for Midas the Phrygian is only the best-known example (χαλκῆ παρθένος εἰμι, Μίδα δ' **ἐπὶ** σήματι **κεῖμαι** "I am a bronze maiden, and I have been placed on the tomb of Midas"[30]). And monuments can be expected in their permanency to be noticed and read by a potentially unlimited set of passers-by. The anonymous symposiasts in the future who are reacting to Theognis' seal are functionally similar to such passers-by.

The sympotic songs of Theognis marked with the *sphrēgís* are of course at the same time very different from a monument: they actively seek their recipients, whereas Midas' epigram has to wait for readers to come to it. Theognis moves around and has therefore to be actively conscious of the dangers of the songs' distribution. Alongside the *sphrēgís* poem the following fragment seems to address this issue:

> τόρνου καὶ στάθμης καὶ γνώμονος ἄνδρα θεωρόν
>   εὐθύτερον χρὴ ⟨ἔ⟩μεν **Κύρνε φυλασσόμενον**,
> ᾧτινί κεν Πυθῶνι θεοῦ χρήσασ' ἱέρεια
>   ὀμφὴν **σημήνῃ** πίονος ἐξ ἀδύτου·
> οὔτε τι γὰρ προσθεὶς οὐδέν κ' ἔτι φάρμακον εὕροις,
>   οὐδ' ἀφελὼν πρὸς θεῶν ἀμπλακίην προφύγοις.
>
> Thgn. 805–810

> More straight than a carpenter's pin or rule or square
>   must the man who is *theōros* be *when he guards*(,) *Κύρνε*
> he to whom the priestess of the god in Pytho in responding
>   *indicates* a sacred message from the rich shrine.
> Neither in adding anything will you find a remedy anymore
>   nor will you escape error in the eyes of the gods if you take anything out.

29 With respect to ἐπικείσθω we may hesitate between an intransitive ("let it sit") and a passive reading ("let it be placed"); if the latter, then σοφιζομένῳ μὲν ἐμοι turns into an agent expression. The central point remains the same.

30 *AP* 7.153.1; Plat. *Phdr.* 264d3. See further Bakker (2016).

The concept here is *theōria*, the visit to the shrine of Delphi and return to one's home town with the text of the oracle. We may perhaps again discern a *double entendre*. The fragment purports to be a statement, addressed to Kurnos, about *theōria*, with as implicit object of φυλασσόμενον in the second line the text of the oracle; but in coded language the grammatical object of φυλασσόμενον could be Κύρνε ("as he guards 'Κύρνε'"). Would the idea of travel contained in the *theōria* concept imply the traveling and distribution of Theognidean poetry, with the *theōros* traveling between Delphi and his hometown becoming a guardian of the seal who keeps the poetry intact? And what is a better comparandum for the coded language of the poetry that speaks only to those who understand than the Delphic oracle whose discourse is a matter of σημαίνειν 'indicating' rather than straight speech?[31] And the tampering with the poetry that is referred to as ἀλάσσειν κάκιον in the *sphrēgís* poem is here described with the two participles προσθείς and ἀφελών, illicit addition and subtraction—decomposition and recomposition—that is subject to nothing less than divine vengeance.

Trust and Love

The Pythia speaking to an authorized *theōros* is certainly a case of ideal communication: the right speaker to the right addressee under the right circumstances. But what if the message gets relayed? Will the next addressee be as faithful a messenger as the first one? The poetry's stated need for fixity and stability (the right words, the right setting) is counteracted by its equally strong need for mobility: the *sphrēgís* is meant to seal and prevent, but it will equally bring the name of Theognis on everyone's lips. Even if the words don't get changed, will the message still be the same if it is addressed in a new situation to someone less well placed to receive and transmit it? The *sphrēgís*, as we saw, is not only a seal on the wording, but also on the audience. Placing the seal, then, is no less acknowledging the *need* for a seal than preventing change from happening. The idea of the right song with the right subject in the right social setting remains always under threat.

It begins with the words describing the immediate consequence of the placement of the seal: λήσει δ' οὔποτε κλεπτόμενα. The "theft" here is usually understood as literary, as we saw earlier, in line with seeing the seal as the

31 See Heracl. B93 DK with Nagy's (1990) 164–166 discussion of the oracle, *sēmainein*, and Thgn. 805–810 and 543–546.

author label. This relies on the idea of a poet-author and of aspiring poet-authors preying on the poetry, intent on plagiarizing it. But in line with the idea put forward that the seal is about more than mere words and includes the words' setting, we may observe that the semantic field of *klep-* is wider than just (property) theft and that it also encompasses cheating, deception, and betrayal. The "theft" may not be just a theft of words or text, but also a theft of setting, a performance of the songs with the right circumstances lacking. In such a case the singer may not be well-disposed, εὖ φρονέων, or he may not have had the right instruction himself, instruction from the ἀγαθοί or ἐσθλοί (ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν). Either way, correct transmission, of the songs and of the wisdom they contain, would be compromised. But the seal would not let this go undetected.

The seal as a protection device is at the same time an acknowledgment of the dangers against which the protection is put in place. The *sphrēgís* song readily admits this, by placing the right transfer of songs and their wisdom from generation to generation against the backdrop of a less than universal acceptance of the singer's wisdom. The song shrugs this off as a fact of nature: "I cannot yet please all townspeople, but there is nothing surprising there, son of Polypaos; not even Zeus can please all people all the time, whether he rains or holds back" (vv. 24–26). But Theognis is not always so placid. Resistance to the songs' political and moral message is paired with the observation that few people can really be trusted and that good men, *agathoí*, whose loyalty does not wither under adversity and withstands the test of time, are few and far between.

Trust, or the lack of it, is in fact the dominant theme in the songs (or fragments) that contain Κύρνε or the concomitant patronymic vocative Πολυπαΐδη. "Never, *Kúrne*, trust a bad man and make plans with him when you want to complete a serious project" (vv. 69–70); "When taking on big projects, put your trust in only few men, *Kúrne*, or you'll get into incurable grief" (75–76); "You will find few companions (ἄνδρας ἑταίρους), *Polypaïdē*, who are trustworthy under difficult circumstances, who would take it upon themselves with a like-minded spirit to share in both good and bad fortune alike" (79–82). In all these cases the performance setting of the songs makes their advice much more pungent than we sometimes suppose it is: this is not, or not only, about people in town, much less about humanity in general; the distrust is performed right in the symposium and may well apply to the very group gathered there, listening to the song. In the last quote, "companions" is the translation of ἄνδρας ἑταίρους, an expression naturally taken as referring to the singer's fellow symposiasts, or at least emphatically not excluding them.

The symposium, then, is an ambiguous, possibly even dangerous place for Theognis. It provides the setting for the right transmission of the songs and their wisdom, but it also poses dangers to that very transmission. And matters

become worse once one realizes that it is often not easy to see who is to be trusted and who is not. People are like coins, and coins can be counterfeit. To detect the spurious nature of a false friendship is much harder than to know counterfeit money for what it is (vv. 116–117; 119–126). Worse, money itself has thrown a once reliable dividing line between "good" (*esthlós*) and "bad" (*kakós*) into disarray: people behave strangely and irrationally because of wealth and money, compromising even their own lineage (e.g., by marrying someone "bad" for money), even if they are deeply concerned about the purity of their rams', mules', and horses' breeding (vv. 183–184). Wealth, or its anomalous distribution, has made the race impure (πλοῦτος ἔμειξε γένος, v. 190).

Kurnos (yes, the nominative) is a hero, son of Heracles and presumably the eponymous hero of the island of Kurnos, Corsica; in other words, a real aristocrat, and a worthy recipient of the songs' wisdom.[32] But κύρνος means "bastard" and Πολυπαΐδης "son of Much-Earner."[33] It looks as if Theognis' ideal listener, whose presence is essential for the correct transmission of the poetry, is at the same time part of the problem that this poetry faces. The collection contains numerous direct addresses concerning distrust or betrayal. "Do not show affection to me just with words, while you keep your mind and your heart away (μή μ' ἔπεσιν μὲν στέργε, νόον δ' ἔχε καὶ φρένας ἄλλῃ), if you really love me and your mind can be trusted" (vv. 87–88), goes one song, and another brings back some key terms from the *sphrēgís* poem:

οὔ μ' **ἔλαθες** φοιτῶν κατ' ἀμαξιτόν, ἣν ἄρα καὶ πρὶν
ἠλάστρεις **κλέπτων** ἡμετέρην φιλίην.
ἔρρε, θεοῖσίν τ' ἐχθρὲ καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἄπιστε,
ψυχρὸν ὃς ἐν κόλπῳ **ποικίλον** εἶχες ὄφιν.
Thgn. 599–602

You *did not escape my notice* when you went along the path that evidently you drove
earlier, "*stealing*" (*betraying/cheating on*) our love/friendship.
Go, you who are hateful to the gods and untrustworthy to men,
you who ⟨, I now see, ⟩ had a cold and *variegated* snake in your breast.

32 Hdt 1.167.4; Serv. in Virg. Ecl. 9.30.

33 Hesychius: "κύρνοι· οἱ νόθοι" (the plural is unclear to me). Phot. *Lex.* 1255 Κύρνος· ἐρώμενος Θεόγνιδος· Μακεδόνες δὲ τοὺς σκοτίους κύρνους καλοῦσιν. Modern historical-comparative linguistics provides evidence for an original Indo-European meaning "foal," a meaning with affective and hypocoristic potential that would suit the erotic (and the genealogical!) context well, but it is not otherwise attested in Greek; see Forsmann 1980.

The Theognidean singer may be outraged by the behavior of this “bad” Kurnos, but the situation becomes even more complicated when we hear songs in which the addressee is actively encouraged precisely to be “variegated” (*poikílos*) and duplicitous:

Κύρνε, φίλους πρὸς πάντας ἐπίστρεφε **ποικίλον** ἦθος,
    συμμίσγων ὀργὴν οἷος ἕκαστος ἔφυ.
νῦν μὲν τῷδ’ ἐφέπου, τοτὲ δ’ ἀλλοῖος πέλευ ὀργήν.
    κρεῖσσόν τοι σοφίη καὶ μεγάλης ἀρετῆς.
        Thgn. 1071–1074

Kurne, turn your *shifting* demeanor to all your friends,
    blending in your temperament ⟨so as to come across⟩ such as each of them is like.
Go along with this man now, be of different temperament another time:
    You know, ⟨such⟩ skill is stronger even than great virtue.

Not only is Kurnos here actively encouraged to be opportunistic and chameleonesque, to be a counterfeit coin; this is at the same time one of the cases where the very value of the seal is put to the test, as different versions of the same song exist:

θυμέ, φίλους κατὰ πάντας ἐπίστρεφε ποικίλον ἦθος,
    ὀργὴν συμμίσγων ἥντιν’ ἕκαστος ἔχει·
πουλύπου ὀργὴν ἴσχε **πολυπλόκου**, ὃς ποτὶ πέτρῃ,
    τῇ προσομιλήσῃ, τοῖος ἰδεῖν ἐφάνη.
νῦν μὲν τῇδ’ ἐφέπου, τοτὲ δ’ ἀλλοῖος χρόα γίνου.
    κρέσσων τοι σοφίη γίνεται **ἀτροπίης**.
        Thgn. 213–218

My heart, turn your shifting demeanor alongside all your friends,
    Adding to the mix the temperament that each one has.
Keep to the ways of the octopus of many twists, which on the rock
    To which it clings appears to look alike.
Go along with this man now, but change your color another time.
    You know, ⟨such⟩ skill is stronger than lack of twists or turns.

This song has *thumé* substituted for *Kúrne*. In using *polu-* epithets it plays with Odyssean themes:[34] the speaker exhorts himself to be versatile, in coping with a

34 Note that the octopus, πολύπους, itself evokes Odysseus; cf. *Od.* 5.432.

shifting social environment: such skill is better than *atropiē*, the state of being resourceless, denoted by an abstract noun that evokes Odysseus' signature epithet *polútropos*. The version of the song with *Kúrne* instead of *thumé* suppresses the Odyssean themes, but turns the versatility the addressee is urged to practice into something far more provocative: instead of being superior simply to not being versatile (*atropiē* 'inflexibility', being construed as something negative), the shifting and variegated disposition of the *poikílon* persona is said to be better than nothing less than "great virtue" (μεγάλης ἀρετῆς).

Tricks and Fame

What has happened here? Has Theognis been stolen in a way that the *sphrēgís* song is trying to prevent? Has someone taken a *Kúrne* song and turned it into a soliloquy? Or has someone created a *Kúrne* song out of the soliloquy? Is this song sung by the well-intentioned (εὖ φρονέων) singer that the speaker of the *sphrēgís* poem pretends to be? Is the song's voice the same as the one that complains extensively about lack of trust? Or is this perhaps a sympotic game, in which existing songs are "rewritten" and "signed" with the *Kúrne* seal?[35] If "Kurnos" is urged to be shifting, variegated, and calculating, he may possibly become unfaithful to "Theognis." And in that case the poetry may have been performed in a context with an audience for which it was not originally meant. In that case the *sphrēgís* Κύρνε was apparently not able to seal the poetry and its recipient(s), the context of its performance. Theognis has become famous, as the *sphrēgís* poem predicted, but at a considerable cost.

The addressee's infidelity, in other words, is at the center of Theognis' poetics, and somehow crucially connected with the poetry's panhellenic aspirations. One song in particular places this issue front and center:

σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ πτέρ' ἔδωκα, σὺν οἷς ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πόντον
πωτήσῃ, κατὰ γῆν πᾶσαν ἀειρόμενος
ῥηϊδίως· θοίνῃς δὲ καὶ εἰλαπίνῃσι παρέσσῃ
ἐν πάσαις, πολλῶν κείμενος ἐν στόμασιν,
καί σε σὺν αὐλίσκοισι λιγυφθόγγοις νέοι ἄνδρες
εὐκόσμως ἐρατοὶ καλά τε καὶ λιγέα

35 See Gagné (2013) 251, 257, who does not speak specifically of *Kúrne* as seal; on "capping" in the symposium, see Collins (2004). Relevant is also the discussion of *skolia* by Martin (Chapter 3, this volume).

ᾄσονται. καὶ ὅταν δνοφερῆς ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης
    βῇς πολυκωκύτους εἰς Ἀΐδαο δόμους,
οὐδέποτ' οὐδὲ θανὼν ἀπολεῖς κλέος, ἀλλὰ **μελήσεις**
    ἄφθιτον ἀνθρώποις αἰὲν ἔχων **ὄνομα**,
Κύρνε, καθ' Ἑλλάδα γῆν στρωφώμενος, ἠδ' ἀνὰ νήσους
    ἰχθυόεντα περῶν πόντον ἐπ' ἀτρύγετον,
οὐχ ἵππων νώτοισιν ἐφήμενος· ἀλλά σε πέμψει
    ἀγλαὰ Μουσάων δῶρα ἰοστεφάνων.
πᾶσι δ', ὅσοισι μέμηλε, καὶ ἐσσομένοισιν ἀοιδὴ
    ἔσσῃ ὁμῶς, **ὄφρ' ἂν γῆ τε καὶ ἠέλιος.**
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ὀλίγης παρὰ σεῦ οὐ τυγχάνω αἰδοῦς,
    ἀλλ' ὥσπερ μικρὸν παῖδα λόγοις μ' ἀπατᾷς.

To you I have given wings, with which to the boundless sea
    you will fly, lifted over the entire earth,
easily; at feasts and banquets *you will be present*,
    at all of them, *placed* in the mouths of many;
and with their pipes of clear sound the young men
    lovely in decorous fashion, beautiful and clear songs
they will sing you; and when in the depths of the gloomy earth
    you will go into the much-wailing abode of Hades,
you will never, not even in death, lose your *kléos*; no, *you will be on the mind*
    of the people, always, with a *name* unwilting,
Kurne, roaming all over the land of Hellas and through the islands,
    crossing the barren sea rich in fish,
not riding on horseback; your vehicle instead will be
    the splendid gifts of the Muses crowned with violets,
and to all those who care, even men of the future, song
    you will be, equally ⟨to all⟩, as long as earth and sun ⟨exist⟩.
But I, I do not even get the slightest respect from you;
    no, as if I am a small boy you are deceiving me with idle talk.

This song can be seen as a counterpart to the *sphrēgís* poem and both may have bookended the original Theognidean *sylloge*;[36] the song reads as a reflection on the effects and results of the *sphrēgís*: κείμενος (240) directly resonates with (σφρηγὶς) ἐπικείσθω (19); παρέσσῃ (239) picks up (τοὐσθλοῦ) παρεόντος (21),

36 See Selle (2008) 180–183 with literature.

and ἀνθρώποις αἰὲν ἔχων ὄνομα (246), goes back to πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός (23).[37] The famous name and its universal recognition is "Theognis" in the *sphrēgís* poem, as triggered by the vocative Κύρνε; in the present poem, conversely, it is *Kurnos*—notice the juxtaposition of Κύρνε with ὄνομα in 246–247—as carried by the renown of Theognis' poetry. In other words, speaker and listener in their sympotic bond are interdependent: the one owes the other the renown of his name.[38]

But whereas the relation in the *sphrēgís* poem is intimacy, the ideal instruction of a boy by an older male in the face of resistance to the singer's songs, here we have, conversely, erotic frustration against the backdrop of the poetry's universal, panhellenic renown. The two poems mark the transition from local sympotic song sung in stable settings to song of panhellenic distribution sung in a wide variety of settings. The inevitable decreased control over the audiences in the free circulation of the poetry is couched in terms of the erotico-sympotic bond on which the poetry's intended instruction is based.

Kúrne's renown is expressed in solidly Homeric terms. The vocative "*Kúrne*" will be ἄφθιτον 'imperishable', just like the *kléos* of Achilles (*Il.* 9.413), the kind of fame that does not come into being until its beneficiary has died. The *kléos* of Achilles is further alluded to (245 οὐδέποτ' οὐδὲ θανὼν ἀπολεῖς κλέος) in a clear reference to the discussion of Achilles' death and funeral in Book 24 of the *Odyssey*:

> ὣς σὺ μὲν οὐδὲ θανὼν ὄνομ' ὤλεσας, ἀλλά τοι αἰεὶ
> πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους κλέος ἔσσεται ἐσθλόν, Ἀχιλλεῦ
> HOM. *Od.* 24.93–94

> Thus not even in death did you lose your name; no, forever
> to all the people will your *kléos* be noble, Achilles,

where πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους provides the intertext for πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους in the *sphrēgís* poem (Thgn. 23). But the most significant allusion is to the *kléos* of Odysseus, through a rare personal use of the verb μέλω 'to be on the mind of', 'to be a concern to' (245 ἀλλὰ μελήσεις) which refers to the words with which Odysseus identifies himself to the Phaeacians:

37 On the relation between the two poems, see also Reitzenstein (1970) 268–269.

38 In Bakker (2016) I discuss this interdependence in the context of sepulchral epigram with its "competition" for *kléos* between the buried person and the tomb's commissioner. Sepulchral elements in Thgn. 237–254 include κείμενος (240), the reference to Achilles' funeral and tomb (245, see below), and the allusion to the Midas Epigram (252, see below).

εἴμ' Ὀδυσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν
ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει.
Od. 9.19–20

I am Odysseus son of Laertes, who with [all] my ruses
Am on the mind of all the people; and my *kléos* reaches into heaven.

This is how Odysseus presents himself, as the man with the shifting, variegated mind (*poikilomētēs*), the paragon of *polutropiē,* and the embodied opposite of *atropiē*.[39] The combination of Odysseus' tricks and fame is a model for the fame and immortality of the Theognis songs.

The *sphrēgís*, then, is an inherently ambiguous device. It seals and it discloses; it signals trust without fame and fame without trust. In marking the songs' immortality through an association with funereal monumentality—ὄφρ' ἂν γῆ τε καὶ ἠέλιος 'as long as earth and sun ⟨exist⟩' in 252 is possibly a direct allusion to the Midas epigram[40]—it highlights the mortality of its recipient and the ambition of this poetry to transcend the time and place of the life of any single individual member of its audience.

The *sphrēgís* can only be meaningful as a marker on a work, a collection of songs with a coherent voice and message. The *sphrēgís* can indeed be seen as a "principle of thrift," provided we see the restriction imposed as social no less than textual; but it willingly and expressly opens the door to a "proliferation of meaning," in exposing the songs to a wide variety of audiences all over the Greek world. The result is the collection of Theognidea that many scholars believe is "too large," including songs that actually refer to Megara or that cannot be the compositions of the archaic Megarian poet. But a "pure" Theognis, a collection without accretions and alterations, recompositions and semantic proliferations, would not have ensured the songs' survival.

The seal, then, was breached, as a consequence of the inherent conflict between local and global, between faithful transmission between faithful lovers and the *kléos* resulting from wide diffusion and reception by parties not so trustworthy. The erotic crisis of an unfaithful "Kurnos," in a meta-poetic, meta-sympotic way of saying, was necessary for the author's fame.

---

39 Other references to adaptability and/or Odyssean features occur in 367 (γνῶναι νόον ἀστῶν: cf. *Od.* 1.3 ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω), 1071–1074.

40 ἔστ' ἂν ὕδωρ τε ῥέῃ καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήλῃ | ἠέλιός τ' ἀνιὼν λάμπῃ, λαμπρά τε σελήνη, from the version cited in *Vit. Hom. Herodot.* (135–140 Allen).

Bibliography

Austin, J.L. 1975. *How to do Things with Words*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA.

Bakker, E.J. 1997. *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Ithaca.

Bakker, E.J. 2005. *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*. Washington.

Bakker, E.J. 2009. "Homer, Odysseus, and the Narratology of Performance." In *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, ed. J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos, 117–136. Berlin.

Bakker, E.J. 2016. "Archaic Epigram and the Seal of Theognis." In *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram*, ed. E. Sistakou, 195–213. Berlin.

Bowie, E. 1997. "The *Theognidea*: A Step Towards a Collection of Fragments?" In *Collecting Fragments–Fragmente Sammeln*, ed. G.W. Most, 53–66. Göttingen.

Calame, C. 2004. "Identités d'auteur à l'exemple de la Grèce classique: signatures, énonciations, citations." In *Identités d'auteur dans l'Antiquité et la tradition européenne*, ed. C. Calame and R. Chartier, 11–39. Paris.

Campbell, D.A. 1982. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Rev. ed. London.

Colesanti, G. 2011. *Questioni teognidee. La genesi simposiale di un corpus di elegie*. Rome.

Collins, D. 2004. *Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry*. Washington.

Edmunds, L. 1997. "The Seal of Theognis." In *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*, ed. L. Edmunds and R.W. Wallace, 29–48. Baltimore.

Fain, G.L. 2006. "Apostrophe and *ΣΦΡΗΓΙΣ* in the Theognidean Sylloge." *CQ* 56: 301–304.

Faraone, C.A. 2008. *The Stanzaic Architecture of Early Greek Elegy*. New York.

Ford, A. 1985. "The Seal of Theognis: The Politics of Authorship in Archaic Greece." In *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, ed. T.J. Figueira and G. Nagy, 82–95. Baltimore.

Forssman, B. 1980. "Hethitisch *kurka*- Comm. 'Fohlen'." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94: 70–74.

Foucault, M. 1979. "What is an Author?" In *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, ed. J.V. Harari, 141–160. Ithaca.

Gagné, R. 2013. *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.

Groningen, B.A. van. 1966. *Théognis, Le premier livre, édité avec un commentaire*. *Verhandelingen der koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, nieuwe reeks* 72.1. Amsterdam.

Hubbard, T.K. 2007. "Theognis' *Sphrêgis*: Aristocratic Speech and the Paradoxes of Writing." In *Politics of Orality*, ed. C. Cooper, 193–215. Leiden.

Jacoby, F. 1931. "Theognis." *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin, Philologisch-Historische Klasse*: 90–180. Berlin.

Kranz, W. 1967. “Sphragis.” In *Studien zur Antiken Literatur und ihrem Fortwirken*, 27–78 (= *RhM* 104 (1961), 3–46, 97–124).

Kroll, J. 1936. *Theognisinterpretationen*. Leipzig.

Lane Fox, R. 2000. “Theognis: An Alternative to Democracy.” In *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*, ed. R. Brock and S. Hodkinson, 35–51. Oxford.

von Leutsch, E. 1870. “Theognis. Jahresbericht.” *Philologus* 29: 504–548; 636–690.

Nagy, G. 1985. “Theognis and Megara: A Poet’s Vision of His City.” In *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, ed. T.J. Figueira and G. Nagy, 22–81. Baltimore.

Nagy, G. 1990. *Pindar’s Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.

Pratt, L. 1995. “The Seal of Theognis, Writing, and Oral Poetry.” *American Journal of Philology* 116: 171–184.

Reitzenstein, R. 1970 (1893). *Epigramm und Skolion*. Repr. Hildesheim.

Ruijgh, C.J. 1990. “La place des enclitiques dans l’ordre des mots chez Homère d’après la loi de Wackernagel.” In *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, ed. H. Eichner and H. Rix, 213–233. Wiesbaden.

Schironi, F. 2010. “Technical Languages: Science and Medicine.” In *A Companion to the Greek Language*, ed. E.J. Bakker, 338–353. Malden.

Selle, H. 2008. *Theognis und die Theognidea*. Berlin.

Steffen, V. 1968. *Die Kyrnos-Gedichte des Theognis*. Wroclaw.

Svenbro, J. 1976. *La parole et le marbre. Aux origines de la poétique grecque*. Lund.

Wees, H. van 2000. “Megara’s Maffiosi: Timocracy and Violence in Theognis.” In *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*, ed. R. Brock and S. Hodkinson, 52–67. Oxford.

Welcker, F.G., ed. 1826. *Theognidis Reliquiae*. Frankfurt.

West, M.L. 1974. “On the History of the Theognidean Sylloge.” In *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, 40–71. Berlin.

Woodbury, L. 1952. “The Seal of Theognis.” In *Studies in Honour of Gilbert Norwood*, ed. M.E. White, 20–41. Toronto.

Young. D., ed. 1961. *Theognis* (*et al.*). Leipzig.

CHAPTER 6

Authenticity and Autochthonous Traditions in Archaic and Hellenistic Lyric Poetry

Jacqueline Klooster

We are all familiar with the feeling that places where famous historical authors have once dwelt still exude a kind of inspiration for those with the appropriate sensibility: they become a specific type of cultural *lieux de mémoire*, places of intrinsic interest, formative of the identity of nations, or local regions. Hence the busloads of tourists in Stratford upon Avon or, admittedly in much lesser numbers, at the site of Plato's Academy, nowadays a somewhat seedy little park in an Athenian suburb.

This particular sentiment is illustrated for later antiquity by an intriguing passage from Cicero's *De Finibus*. Piso, on a stroll through Athens, recounts the following experience on visiting the site of Plato's Academy:

> *Naturane nobis hoc, inquit, datum dicam an errore quodam, ut, cum ea loca videamus, in quibus memoria dignos viros acceperimus multum esse versatos, magis moveamur, quam si quando eorum ipsorum aut facta audiamus aut scriptum aliquod legamus? Velut ego nunc moveor. Venit enim mihi Platonis in mentem, ... cuius etiam illi hortuli propinqui non memoriam solum mihi afferunt, sed ipsum videntur in conspectu meo ponere.*
>
> Whether it is a natural instinct or mere illusion, I can't say, but *one's emotions are more strongly aroused by seeing the places that tradition records to have been the favorite resort of men of note in former days, than by hearing about their deeds or reading their writings*. My own feelings at the present moment are a case in point indeed the garden close by over there not only recalls Plato's memory, ... but seems to bring the actual man before my eyes.
>
> CIC. *Fin.* 5.1.2; tr. Rackham, modified

Afterwards, the other members of the company, Quintus, Cicero, and Lucius Torquatus all admit to similar experiences in Colonus (Sophocles), Metapontus (Pythagoras), and the favorite haunts of Demosthenes and Pericles respectively.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_008

An interesting aspect of this passage is the emotional sense of the presence of the famous dead that is emphasized and that the locality apparently suggests or conveys much more forcefully and authentically than anecdotes about their lives or, surprisingly perhaps, their own writings could, according to the speaker. Paradoxically, Piso here seems to deny the power of literature to evoke the presence of an author, or at least, he claims that there are superior ways of getting into contact with him: by visiting the places where he dwelt in his lifetime.

Perhaps this hides an ironic comment by Cicero on the frantic search for "authenticity" of literate young Romans in Athens: a misguided, childish sense of personal contact with the past derived from tourism rather than from burning the midnight oil and real immersion into an author's thoughts. Alternatively, it may of course also be the case that in this particularly Platonic context, Cicero is alluding to the Platonic idea that spoken dialogue (dialectic) is preferable to *written texts* in the search for philosophical truth. However, the other examples, in particular that of Sophocles, fit this latter explanation rather less well.

At any rate, the passage casts an interesting light on one particular aspect of authenticity in literary experience in antiquity on which I wish to focus in this paper. How far does *place*, that is to say, the original geographical, spatial context associated with an author, contribute to the authenticity of a literary experience? In other words, how and why are the original (geographical) context and local tradition important for the appreciation, creation, or adaptation of a specific type of poetry? Did the ancient Greeks and Romans really feel they needed to visit Athens to understand Plato, or for instance, Lesbos to appreciate, imitate, or emulate Sappho? How is this issue reflected in literary texts and *testimonia*?

I will look in particular at some Hellenistic poets and their approach to this question. The paradox, especially when we think of the Alexandrian scholar-poets, in their situation is clear: they possessed, to a greater extent than anyone reading or writing before their age, accessible and specialized critical and biographical information about poets of the past, who were culturally and geographically as well as temporally remote from their own context.[1] The archaic poets were accessible to the scholar poets of Alexandria because of the precise categorization, classification, and preservation of all works of Greek literature in the great royal library of the Ptolemies (and similar conditions presumably

1 Cf., e.g., Pfeiffer (1968) 87; Bing (1988) *passim*; Bulloch (1989) 542; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 1–26.

applied across the Greek world at other royal courts, such as the Pergamene one). But was this kind of scholarly accessibility enough? Could the Alexandrian poets simply stay in the Alexandrian Library, read and study the scrolls and critical commentaries there, and then go on to apply themselves to writing in genres that had originated in specific geographic regions in specific cultural contexts and historical periods? What would be the status of such poetry? Is it *authentic* in any way? To put it differently, does it strive to be authentic in the same way as its original? Or is this, in and of itself, an impossible aim?

To illustrate the problem, let us look very briefly, and without attempting to reach a conclusion, at Theocritus *Idyll* 28, the so-called *Distaff*. A quotation of the opening lines may serve to illustrate the point I wish to make:

> Γλαύκας, ὦ φιλέριθ' ἀλακάτα, δῶρον Ἀθανάας
> γύναιξιν νόος οἰκωφελίας αἶσιν ἐπάβολος,
> θέρσεισ' ἄμμιν ὐμάρτη πόλιν ἐς Νείλεος ἀγλάαν,
> ὅππα Κύπριδος ἶρον καλάμω χλῶρον ὐπ' ἀπάλω.
> τυίδε γὰρ πλόον εὐάνεμον αἰτήμεθα πὰρ Δίος,
> ὅππως ξέννον ἔμον τέρψομ' ἴδων κἀντιφιληθέω,
> Νικίαν, Χαρίτων ἰμεροφώνων ἴερον φύτον …
>
> Wool-loving distaff, gift of green-eyed Athena, helpmeet of women whose mind is turned to housekeeping, confidently accompany me to Neleus' illustrious city (Miletus), where a sanctuary of Aphrodite is shadowed by green reeds. For there we seek well-sped journey from Zeus, that I may rejoice seeing my guest friend and enjoy mutual friendship, Nicias, holy shoot of the lovely-voiced Graces …
>
> tr. GOW, modified

Hopkinson aptly characterizes this poem as "an exotic production—it is written in Aeolic meter by a Dorian for an Ionian destination."[2] Indeed, it was written by the Syracusan (and hence Dorian-speaking) Theocritus for his friend the Milesian doctor Nicias,[3] in Aeolic dialect and meter.[4] We may wonder what Theocritus meant to convey by these choices. Is the poem a technical *tour de*

2 Hopkinson (1988) 172. We may also think of Philiscus (*SH* 676–680) who gave his *Hymn to Demeter* an Attic dialectal color appropriate to the setting at Eleusis (although he worked in Egypt under Ptolemy Philadelphus).

3 On Nicias, see Gow and Page (1965, II) 428–429.

4 Other Aeolic-dialect *Idylls* of Theocritus are 29 and 30, and a fragment found on a papyrus from Antinoe. See on these poems Hunter (1996) 167–206.

force, an illustration of poetic virtuosity and erudition? Is it meant to be indistinguishable from some (lost, or quasi-lost) Aeolic archaic original?[5] Probably not the latter, since, as Hunter notes,[6] in contrast with its *formal* characteristics, its theme and topic (a poetic letter accompanying a gift) appear to be post-classical.

In calling a poem "The Distaff" and writing in Aeolic dialect and meter, Theocritus seems to be referring to the poetry of Erinna (known foremost from her poem known under the same name about the death of her childhood friend Baucis) and that of Sappho; he may even be expressing the idea that Erinna was a follower of Sappho. Still, this leaves us with the question: what is the *status* of this poem qua poem, does it pretend to be more than just a clever pastiche, or an evocation and combination of allusions to female poets of the past?

Authenticity in Hellenistic Literary Culture

Authenticity was important in Hellenistic literary culture in various forms, in matters of ascription, in the establishment of texts, and in the search for origins of generic forms. At the same time, the Hellenistic scholar-poets are if anything notorious for the so-called *Kreuzung der Gattungen*, a term that of itself denotes *inauthenticity*. If we wish to phrase this last observation differently and perhaps more aptly, we could say that their poetry is often an adaptation of traditional generic forms to a new cultural context.[7]

All these characteristics taken together would seem to point to what we might term an authenticity-paradox. On the one hand, there is an impulse to categorize, classify, and define, in a word, *authenticate*, traditional poetry; on the other, the works of the Hellenistic poets themselves constantly reveal adaptation, imitation and innovation of traditional material. To paraphrase Luigi Enrico Rossi who first observed this: first there were generic rules, but they were un-written; then there were documented generic rules, but their writing down seems only to have facilitated their being broken by the Hellenistic poets.[8]

5 Cf. the cautious suggestion of Hopkinson (1988) 172: "This is an experimentally archaic piece in imitation of Sappho and Alcaeus, perhaps modelled on specific poems by them on similar themes." Cf. Palumbo Stracca (1993) 447: "una ripresa dell' antica lirica eolica, basata su una sostanziale fedelta al modello."

6 Hunter (1996) 174.

7 Cf., e.g., Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 17–21.

8 Cf. Rossi (1971) 69–94.

These issues have of course been amply addressed in scholarship, but in this paper I will look at them from a very specific angle. The point I will make is that the paradox I just sketched is particularly visible in the Hellenistic approach to *geographically localized* poetical traditions. On the one hand we see a much stronger emphasis than before on the coupling of a particular geographical region or location (city, island) to a specific author or genre, as the home ground of the genre and/or the author ("autochthonous tradition" seems to define a certain type of authenticity), while on the other hand we continuously encounter the claim that poetry is *not* bound to one location or context, but could be produced anywhere, and appreciated everywhere, regardless of genre or local traditions. The loss of the original performance context by the progressively literate nature of appreciating and producing art in the Hellenistic era may well have been partly responsible for this latter development, as for instance Bing (1988) and Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) have argued extensively.

Mapping the Poets

Let us now turn to some concrete examples of the way the authenticity issue features in Hellenistic poetry. Among literary interests of the Hellenistic age, the question of where archaic poets had been born and died, and where and how genres had originated figured prominently,[9] as countless epigrams from the *Palatine Anthology* (as well as many other literary texts) testify. There is for instance dispute about the birthplace of Homer between Salamis, Chios, and Colophon;[10] likewise, the tradition that Alcman was born in Sardis but became a successful poet in Sparta appealed to poetic imagination (AP 7.709; Alex. Aet.; AP 7.19 Leonidas).

The respective claims for Chios and Salamis (in all likelihood the Cyprian town, not the island)[11] as birthplace of Homer are referenced in the following

9 Cf. Krevans (1983) 201–220, who, in discussing the geographical indications as literary allusion in Theocritus 7, illustrates this phenomenon for other Hellenistic poetry.

10 Cf., e.g., AP 7.7: (Egyptian) Thebes; AP 7.409, *APl.* 292: Colophon; of course Smyrna was also a candidate (cf., e.g., Pind. fr. 264, Proclus *Vit. Hom.* p. 26 Wil.). The site of Homer's death also excited interest: this was located on Ios (AP 7.1) or Icus (AP 7.2). AP 7.4 merely refers to "a small island."

11 Cf. *Vit. Hom.* p. 31 Wil., which asserts that according to Callicles (of uncertain date) Homer was a native of Salamis on Cypris; cf. also [Plut.] *Vit. Hom.* p. 25 Wil. The *Suda* wavers between Salaminian and Cyprian, possibly in an unawareness of the existence of a Cyprian town of this name, cf. Gow and Page (1965, II) 26.

(problematic) epigram, which, as Gow and Page (1965: 26) suggest "would make sense if [its] author had seen or heard of a statue of Homer erected in Salamis as of a local celebrity."

> AP 7.5 (ΑΔΗΛΟΝ, οἱ δὲ φασιν ΑΛΚΑΙΟΥ ΜΙΤΥΛΗΝΑΙΟΥ)
> Οὐδ' εἴ με χρύσειον ἀπὸ ῥαιστῆρος Ὅμηρον
> στήσητε φλογέαις ἐν Διὸς ἀστεροπαῖς,
> οὐκ εἴμ' οὐδ' ἔσομαι Σαλαμίνιος οὐδ' ὁ Μέλητος
> Δημαγόρου· μὴ ταῦτ' ὄμμασιν Ἑλλὰς ἴδοι.
> ἄλλον ποιητὴν βασανίζετε· τἀμὰ δέ, Μοῦσαι
> καὶ Χίος, Ἑλλήνων παισὶν ἀείσετ' ἔπη.

> No, not even if you would put me, a Homer of beaten gold, in the way of Zeus' lightning flashes (?),[12] I am not nor will ever be Salaminian, nor will I, the son of Meles, become the son of Demagoras.[13] Let Hellas not see this with her eyes. Put another poet to the touchstone. My epics, o Muses and Chios, *you* will perform for the children of the Greeks.

In general, it is safe to say that there are very few Hellenistic epigrams or, more broadly speaking, literary references, that name archaic (or classical) poets while failing to refer either to their birthplace or to the site of their grave. Poets are firmly anchored in geographical space, preferably to a specific place. Geographical allusion in fact becomes a sort of metonymy: Anacreon, Sophocles, Homer, Simonides, and Archilochus are also known as respectively the Tean Swan,[14] the Cecropian Star of the Muses,[15] the Chian Bard,[16] the Holy Man from Ceos,[17] the Parian Nightingale,[18] et cetera. A related, but at the same time contrary practice in Hellenistic (and later Roman) poetry is the

---

12 It is not clear what this refers to; perhaps a threatening test (cf. βασανίζετε)? Gow and Page comment (1965, II) 26 *ad loc.* that it might simply mean "gleaming"; this seems to be Beckby's interpretation of the phrase too: "dass ich gleisste wie Zeus' flammendes Wettergeleucht." The preposition sits a bit awkwardly with this interpretation.

13 There were ancient traditions that identified Homer as the son of one Egyptian Masagoras, Damasagoras or Mnasagoras; Demagoras is probably a variant; cf. Gow-Page (1965) 27. It is not clear what the connection with Cyprus could be.

14 Anacreon, *AP* 7.30.

15 Sophocles, *AP* 7.21.

16 Theoc. *Id.* 22.218 = 7.47.

17 Simonides in Call. fr. 64.9; cf. Theoc. *Id.* 16.44.

18 Posidippus (*SH* 118).

well-known trope of referring to a poetical model and hence to a genre *tout court* by means of geographical allusions.[19] We may think of the 4th century BC poetess Erinna, who is called "Lesbian" (cf., e.g., *AP* 9.190), while she was in fact believed to have lived on Tenos or Telos; the allusion of course points to the traditional origin of her kind of poetry (feminine and personal), i.e., as influenced by Lesbian Sappho, rather than to Erinna's own actual origins. This seems also to be the explanation for the (late) lemmas describing Nossis' poems, respectively *AP* 9.332 (which makes her Lesbian) and *AP* 7.718 (which refers to her as a companion of "Mitylenian Sappho").[20] We can compare the earlier observations on Theocritus' reasons for writing his *Distaff*-poem (probably named after Erinna's famous work) in an Aeolic dialect. Somewhat similarly, the Hellenistic author of the pastoral *Lament for Bion*, and later Virgil in his *Eclogues*, call their Muses "Sicilian" in reference to Theocritus of Syracuse as originator of the bucolic genre.

So archaic poets and their generic traditions were being pinpointed, situated in or, conversely, contested between cities and regions: the Hellenistic poets were quite literally mapping out their poetic heritage. And there are indications that this went further than merely constituting a *geistliche Landschaft* or metonymical shorthand. Besides representing a specific scholarly or traditional opinion, the discussions about the localization of the birthplace or grave of an author may also reflect the fact that such a monument held cultural prestige for a city, island or region, and perhaps even attracted visitors. This seems indeed to be borne out by some of the testimony we find about local monuments connected with poets and their homes, (cultic) monuments, or graves. As noted, the small island of Ios claimed Homer's grave and minted coins with his image;[21] on Paros in the third century Mnesiepes established the religious structure called the *Archilocheion*.[22] In Thebes, according to traditional accounts, Pindar's house was spared by Alexander the Great when he destroyed that city, and even Pausanias, writing some seven hundred years after Pindar's

19 Cf. Krevans (1983) who speaks of "the geographical allusion as a peculiarly Alexandrian device to introduce literary acknowledgements."

20 *AP* 9.332 Νοσσίδας Λεσβίας; *AP* 7.718 (apparently interpreted as an epitaph) εἰς Νοσσίδα τὴν ἑταίραν Σαπφοῦς τῆς Μιτυληναίας. On the date of these lemmas, see Gow and Page ad loc.

21 *AP* 7.1; 7.2; 7.6.

22 Cf. Clay (2004). It is often assumed that Posidippus *SH* 118, which expresses the wish of the poet Posidippus to gain some kind of memorial statue in his hometown of Pella (Macedonia) refers to this (recent) monument for Archilochus. Cf. Lloyd-Jones (1963) 75–99.

lifetime, claims still to have seen the poet's house and gravesite.[23] These sites were monuments by virtue of their historical connection with a poet; they are *lieux de mémoire* with high cultural prestige, a city depended on such monuments for its identity.

Sometimes a poet's *literary legacy* was assumed to be actually physically located in his hometown. Thus for instance we are told that Plato, wishing to preserve Antimachus' poetry for posterity, sent Heracleides Ponticus to Colophon "to gather the poems of this man."[24] This anecdote seems to imply that we are dealing with a single authentic, or at least rare, manuscript which had to be saved and (perhaps) copied. In other cases cities may rather have or have been assumed to have stored *authoritative* copies of literary works in archive like-conditions, to be preserved, consulted etc., as had happened with the manuscripts of the Tragedians in Athens. This may also have been the case with the bronze tablets in Ascra on which the *Works and Days* were inscribed, as Pausanias tells us.[25] It is hard to tell whether these references illustrate an actual historical practice, but in any case the fact that the assumption of a link between "authoritative copies" and a poet's hometown was natural is relevant for my argument.

Did monuments like the house of Pindar, the Archilocheion, and the grave of Homer actually attract visitors, perhaps even aspiring poets or other literati, from abroad? Evidence for such poetic pilgrimage is for the (pre-)Hellenistic age rather scanty.[26] The *Aeschylus-Vita* does mention visits of "all those whose livelihood depended on tragedy" to the grave of the tragedian at Gela, Sicily, where they offered sacrifice and recited his dramas.

> εἰς τὸ μνῆμα δὲ φοιτῶντες ὅσοις ἐν τραγωιδίαις ἦν ὁ βίος ἐνήγιζόν τε καὶ τὰ δράματα ὑπεκρίνοντο.
>
> *Aesch. Vit.* 53.54 Page

> All those whose livelihood was in tragedy came to his grave and offered sacrifice and recited his dramas.

Somewhat similarly, it is also recalled how Alexander the Great made a detour to visit and garland the grave of Achilles at Troy, and expressed interest in his

23 Pausanias 9.25.3. See also Plutarch *Alex.* 11; Arrian *Hist. Alex.*1.9.10, Pliny. *Nat. Hist.*7.29, and Dio Chrysostom 2.33.

24 Heracl. Pontic. fr. 92 Voss *ap.* Procl. *in Plat. Tim.* I 21 C I 50 20 Diehl = Wyss *test.* 1.

25 Pausanias 9.31.4.

26 Cf. Treu (1963) 273–290.

lyre (Plut. *Alex.* 15.7), though strictly speaking this act is perhaps more akin to the practice of hero-cults than to literary pilgrimage.

In general, 'disinterested leisure travel' in the sense of an elite hobby was something that got into its own only in the Roman era: think of the Athenian sojourns of Cicero and his likes and the enthusiastic travels of the entourage of emperor Hadrian. Specifically the interest of well-to-do Romans in Greek culture will presumably have influenced such forms of literary tourism. Nevertheless, as we have seen, the consciousness of poets' birthplaces or graves as physical *lieux de mémoire* existed quite early on and is probably connected to the prominence of geographical allusions in literary texts; we shall see that poetic pilgrimage was at least used in Hellenistic poetry as metaphor for gaining privileged access to poetic traditions.

The Metaphor of Travel to the Place of Poetic Origin

This topic of travel metaphor to signify a return, or indeed, a journey *ad fontes* (and *vice versa*) is my next theme. In general, what immediately catches the eye in the Hellenistic poems that reference such issues, is the dynamic movement they describe, either from the place of origin of a particular genre towards its new home, or the other way around.

Dioscorides, for instance, a later Hellenistic epigrammatist (second half of the third century BC), praises the originally Corinthian or Sycionian, but Alexandrian-based comic poet Machon (roughly contemporary with Callimachus) in a (literary?) epitaph:[27]

Τῷ κωμῳδογράφῳ, κούφη κόνι, τὸν φιλάγωνα
   κισσὸν ὑπὲρ τύμβου ζῶντα Μάχωνι φέροις·
οὐ γὰρ ἔχεις κύφωνα[28] παλίμπλυτον, ἀλλά τι τέχνης
   ἄξιον ἀρχαίης λείψανον ἠμφίεσας.
τοῦτο δ' ὁ πρέσβυς ἐρεῖ· "Κέκροπος πόλι, καὶ παρὰ Νείλῳ
   ἔστιν ὅτ' ἐν Μούσαις δριμὺ πέφυκε θύμον."

AP 7.708

27 See Gow and Page (1965, II) 257 on the question of the epigram's authenticity.

28 I here print the suggestion of Gow and Page; the MSS have κηφῆνα, which may mean "drone" (male bee) or "parasite," but fits less well with the metaphorical meaning of the verb πλύνειν (often used in contexts of plagiarism) while κύφων apparently means both "cheap man" and "female garment". Cf. Gow and Page (1965, II) 258.

> Light Earth, bear the living ivy that loves competition on the tomb for the comic poet Machon. For you do not entomb a washed out dress, no, you envelop remains worthy of the old art. The old man will say this: "City of Cecrops, sometimes, pungent thyme grows with the Muses' inspiration along the Nile as well."

Dioscorides makes Machon himself claim proudly that he has successfully conveyed Attic comedy's typical biting wit (pungent thyme) to an Alexandrian context. Dioscorides regards Machon's works as a new lease on life for Attic comedy (this is the implication of the κισσὸν … ζῶντα, 2), not an imitation (κύφωνα παλίμπλυτον, 3), but a remainder worthy of the old art (τι τέχνης / ἄξιον ἀρχαίης λείψανον 4). Despite its emphasis on Machon's success, the epigram makes abundantly clear that Dioscorides sees *archaic, Attic* practice as "the real thing," the standard for authenticity: this is taken from its context entire and planted in new soil, with surprising (and hence exceptional) success.

More subtle are the images in Nossis:[29]

> Ὦ ξεῖν', εἰ τύ γε πλεῖς ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλάναν
> τᾶν Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος ἐναυσόμενος,
> εἰπεῖν, ὡς Μούσαισι φίλαν τήνᾳ τε Λοκρὶς γᾶ
> τίκτε μ' ἴσαις δ' ὅτι μοι τοὔνομα Νοσσίς, ἴθι.
>
> AP 7.718

> Stranger, if you are traveling to Mitylene of the beautiful dancing floors to be inspired by the flower of Sappho's Graces, say that dear to the Muses and equal to her (Sappho) the Locrian land has borne me, and that my name is Nossis. Now go.

In a poem which possesses thematic characteristics of an epitaph,[30] Nossis here urges the traveler who is on his way to Mytilene to be inspired (ἐναυσόμενος, lit. 'to be kindled, lit') by Sappho's charm (which may imply that s/he is a prospective poet, or at least poetically interested) to proclaim Nossis' poetic talents in Sappho's homeland: Nossis is equal to Sappho, she claims. Her engage-

---

29 Some notes on the problematic text. I choose to adhere as closely as possible to the MS of the AP. This means reading ἄνθος (2) rather than αἶθος (Edmunds and Maas) and ἐναυσόμενος rather than ἐπαυρομέναν (Reitzenstein). In 4 the text reads φιλαντηναιτελοκρισσα. I here adopt Brunck's proposal for the text. Line 4 reads τικτεμισαισδοτιμοιτουνομα I here prefer the emendation of Theiler as printed above to that of Brunck (τίκτεν ἴσαν, ὅτι θ' οἱ τοὔνομα).

30 Cf. Asclepiades AP 7.500; Damagetus AP 7.540; Theaetetus AP 7.499.

ment with Sappho proclaims that she sees herself as follower of this poet. But at the same time Nossis stays where she is: she herself does *not* travel to Lesbos, only her reputation and poetry do.[31] A proud claim: her inspiration may derive from Lesbos, but Nossis has pride in her homegrown and generically different poetic achievement, epigrams influenced by, but not strictly imitative of Sappho's poetry.[32]

Nossis wants her fame to become known in Lesbos. This is the self-referential message of the poem, since poetry (perhaps, as suggested, the poetry book of which this epigram was an *envoi*) is the medium through which Nossis' fame will travel. There is thus a movement from Lesbos to Locri and back again, which not only references spatial movement, but also temporal relations. Whereas Sappho could inspire Nossis, and so reach her over a gulf of time, the inspiration cannot go backwards; Nossis' poetry may become famous on Lesbos, but it cannot really engage in dialogue with Sappho's. Nossis can only ever *respond* to Sappho, although she may initiate a new dialogue with those prospective poets who wish also to place themselves in Sappho's tradition.

Callimachus' roughly contemporary 13th *Iambus* (fr. 203 Pf.) uses some strikingly similar imagery and even contains verbal echoes to the epigram just discussed. In this poem, the metaphor of travel is once more used to address the (spatial, cultural, and temporal) distance of Callimachus' Alexandrian poetic practice from the 6th century Ionian original, the Iambic poet Hipponax. Let me begin by quoting the relevant passages of the *Iambus*, and the ancient *Diegesis*:[33]

> Μοῦσαι καλαὶ κἄπολλον, οἷς ἐγὼ σπένδω
> …
> ἐκ γ̣ὰ̣ρ̣ . . . . . .[. οὔτ'] Ἴ̣ω̣σι συμμείξας (11)
> οὔτ' Ἔφεσον ἐλθών, ἥτις ἐστι.αμ.[
> Ἔφεσον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλ˪λοντες
> τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύ˪ονται·
> ἀλλ' εἴ τι θυμὸ̣ν ἢ 'π̣ὶ γαστέρα πν̣ε̣υ̣σ̣.[
> εἴτ' οὖν ἐπ̣ … ἀρχαῖον εἴτ' απ̣αι̣.|[. .].[
> τοῦτ' ἐμπ[έ]πλεκται καὶ λαλευσ|[. .]. .[
> Ἰαστὶ καὶ Δωριστὶ καὶ τὸ σύμμικ|τ̣ο̣ν[

31 For this reason Reitzenstein (1893) 139 and Wilamowitz (1913) 299 already suggested that the epigram was meant as an *envoi* to a book of Nossis' poems. Cf. Gow and Page (1965, II) 442 and Gutzwiller (1998) 86.

32 Gutzwiller (1998) 85–86.

33 All translations of Callimachean texts (and also of the *Diegesis*) are adapted from Nisetich.

Beautiful Muses and Apollo, to whom I pour libations … On the grounds that I 'have not consorted with Ionians and never went to Ephesus … Ephesus, the source of fire for those who would bring forth the lame verses.' 'But you', he goes on, 'if something takes your fancy or stirs your belly, … into the fabric it goes … and out comes a prattle, Ionic and Doric and the two mixed up' …

].δ[ύ]ν̣ηται τὴν γενὴν ἀνακρίνει (54)
κα[ὶ] δοῦλον εἶναί φησι καὶ παλίμπρητον

… looks into his background and calls him a slave, a used one at that …

μηθ.[. .]. . . . . .ν̣ ἀ̣είδω (63)
οὔτ' ⸤Ἔφεσο⸥ν ἐλ⸤θὼ⸥ν οὔτ̣' ⸤Ἴω⸥σι συμμείξας,
Ἔφεσον, ὅθεν π̣ε̣ρ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλλοντες
τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύονται

CALL. fr. 203 Pf., *Iambus* 13

[As for me] I won't [give up …] I sing though I haven't consorted with Ionians and never went to Ephesus, Ephesus the source of fire for those who would bring forth the lame verses.

Despite its damages, it emerges that the speaker, "Callimachus the poet," in this poem defends himself against an anonymous critic. Callimachus is charged with writing Hipponactean *Iambi*, while he has never mixed with the Ionians [. οὔτ'] Ἴ̣ω̣σι συμμείξας, 11, or been to Ephesus, hometown of Hipponax. "Ephesus, where those who wish to bring forth the limping verses (*scazontes*, the typical meter of Hipponactean *Iambus*) not unlearnedly draw their fires," (12–14; 64–66). Moreover, he mixes Doric and Ionian dialects ('Ιαστὶ καὶ Δωριστὶ καὶ τὸ σύμμικ|τ̣ο̣ν[]18).

The *Diegesis* of the poem seems to connect these charges with "*polyeideia*," presumably translatable as "writing in many forms/genres," either specifically in the book of Callimachean *Iambi* (i.e. *formal* variety), or in Callimachus' poetic works in general, in which case the charge of *generic* variation might be more likely.[34]

34 On the meaning of *polyeideia*, see Scodel (1987) 199–215, Kerkhecker (1999), and Acosta-Hughes (2002) ad loc.

> Ἐν τούτῳ πρὸς τοὺς καταμεμφομένους αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ πολυειδείᾳ ὧν γράφει ποιημάτων ἀπαντῶν φησιν ὅτι Ἴωνα μιμεῖται τὸν τραγικόν· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονά τις μέμφεται πολυειδῆ σκεύη τεκταινόμενον.
>
> *Diegesis in Callimachi Iamb.* 1—fr. 203 Pf.

> In this poem Callimachus responds to those who criticize him for the formal variety (*polyeideia*) of his poetry by saying that he is following the example of Ion the tragic poet; [he adds that] no one faults a carpenter for fashioning various articles.

Apparently, then, the cited critic does not think Callimachus capable of producing authenticity, "the real Iambic thing." His iambic poetry is not authentic, because he has not "traveled to Ephesus and convened with Ionians;" a symptom of this is his haphazard mix of poetic dialects. This procedure, by implication, is considered *amathes*, unlearned, whereas those who wish to write authentic iambics, apparently do "travel to Ephesus," i.e., look to the origin of Iambic poetry, and conform to its formal and stylistic laws. The fact that words like "bastard" and "slave" (54–55) seem to be used in Callimachus' later paraphrasing of the critic's charges implies that Callimachus' poetry is in fact considered "impure," i.e., inauthentic.

However, there seems to be an inconsistency in the paraphrase of the critic's charges, particularly in the juxtaposition of the words μὴ ἀμαθῶς with the verb ἐναύονται, since the first expression points to learning (*techne*), whereas the second rather seems to denote (irrational) 'inspiration'. This may of course be deliberate. The critic seems to be represented as being unclear about what he wishes from a poet: is learning or inspiration the key to authenticity?

Some of Callimachus' reply has been lost, but from the *Diegesis* it appears that he revolts against the idea (implied in the criticism) that each poet could only excel in one single form or genre (a conception of poetry that implies quite the opposite of *polyeideia*). This "one poet, one genre-idea," as scholars have recognized,[35] strongly resembles the description of *inspired* poetry as expressed by Socrates prominently in Plato's *Ion* (531E534E, esp. B7–C7). To cite Kerkhecker, who phrases this succinctly (1999: 261–262):

> According to Plato, if poetry were a *techne*, a poet should be able to compose all manner of poetry; for instance, tragedies as well as comedies. In fact, however, each poet masters only one genre. There is no poet

35 See in particular Kerkhecker (1999), Acosta Hughes (2002), and Hunter (1997).

> who commands the whole realm of poetry and this shows that poetry is a divine gift. This does not means that Plato prescribes "one poet, one genre"; indeed an *entechnos poietes* should be able to do all of these things. What Plato does prescribe is the clear distinction of these genres themselves, but this is a new point. … Plato's position is: *polyeideia*, yes; crossing of genres, no. In the light of Plato's writings, Callimachus is making a surprisingly and provocatively Platonic claim: his poetry is not enthusiastic (cf. 32); his is a *techne* (cf. *Aetia* fr. 1.17Pf.); he can write all sorts of poetry.

Interesting in this context is the fact that, to defend his own *polyeideia* (writing in many genres), Callimachus actually chooses the 4th century author Ion of Chios as his model, a tragedian, but one who wrote in many other genres besides.[36] Presumably, then, what Callimachus is really doing here, is playfully teasing his critic: rather than *mixing with Ionians* he is *mixing up his Ions*. As Richard Hunter notes, his paradigm for writing Iambics like Hipponax is … Ion of Chios, or even the Platonic Ion, not the Ionians. "We must at least consider the possibility that Callimachus has somehow run three different Ions together—the eponymn of the Ionians, Ion of Chios and the Platonic character (evoked by the echo of Plato's work)."[37]

In the final lines, Callimachus provocatively echoes the critic's charge that he sings *Iambi* without traveling to Ephesus "where they who wish to bring forth *lame verses* not unwisely draw their fire." Coming after Callimachus' whimsical defense of his own practice, the repetition of this phrase here acquires a subtly sarcastic flavor, as critics have noted.

Iambus 13 gets even more interesting if coupled to Callimachus' first *Iambus* (fr. 191 Pf.) in which Hipponax is represented as having risen from the dead and come to Alexandria. I will not get into the details of this complex, badly damaged poem, but only note (as many have done before) that the exact opposite of what Callimachus' critic urges in *Iambus* 13 is in fact staged here: Hipponax has come from Hades *to Alexandria*.[38] No need for Callimachus to travel to Ephesus, then. In fact, placing a revenant Hipponax in Alexandria looks very much like a metaphor for the "de- or re-contextualization" of this poet's archaic Iambic poetry by the Alexandrian Callimachus. Clearly, then,

---

36 He is credited by Callimachus with epic (?43); tragedy (44); elegy (45); lyric (47). See Henderson (2007) 17–44 on Ion and his remarkable versatility.

37 Hunter (1997) 46.

38 Cf. fr. 191.1–3: Ἀκούσαθ' Ἱππώνακτος· ˻ο˼ὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἥκω / ἐκ τῶν ὅκου βοῦν κολλύ˻βου π˼ιπρή-σκουσιν, /φέρων ἴαμβον οὐ μάχην ˻ἀείδ˼οντα.

the "original cultural context of Hipponax" is not at all the parameter by which Callimachus judges the authenticity or success of his own *Iambi*, even if others, as he claims, try to do this.

In this last poem, then, a spatio-temporal gap, represented as the border between the world of the dead and that of the living must be crossed for the dead predecessor to be able to communicate with the modern world; the past comes to the present, not vice versa.

It is enlightening to compare Callimachus' dream at the opening of the *Aetia* (as reported by the *testimonia*) which carried him as a young man from Libya to Boeotia to converse with the Muses: here the spatial divide is covered in a dream, *by the poet himself*. That Boeotia, land of Hesiod, could be considered the home ground of aetiological stories (i.e., the *Theogony*) is thus implicitly acknowledged, but Callimachus nevertheless refuses to represent himself as actually, physically, covering the distance to this place. This is remarkably consonant with other passages in Callimachus' oeuvre which make clear that—like Hesiod, by the way, cf. *Opera* 648–653—he prefers *not* to travel, not even for the sake of poetry (cf. the Ician guest; *Iambus* 4).[39] We might attractively interpret this as an implicit claim on the part of Callimachus that everything one could know about the world, the past, and in particular the poetic tradition, could be found on the shelves of the Alexandrian Library. For this reason, armchair-travels are enough for Callimachus.

Relating all this to the poem of Nossis discussed earlier, we see that a similar idea underlies the metaphorical configuration of communicating with the literary past: that of reading, writing, and being inspired by texts. All this is very different, then, from Piso's experience with which this essay opened. Whereas Piso thought travel to a place the privileged way to get into contact with the literary luminaries of the past, in Hellenistic poetry the dominant feeling about poetry and places of origin is radically different. Here text is all; real, actual place or space means nothing. The turn from oral performance culture, which demanded a unity of place for the performer/author of poetry and his/her audience, to literary culture, which does not need this, may be partly behind this, although of course already in Pindar (e.g., *Ol.* 6, *Pyth.* 2, *Nem.* 6) and Bacchylides (*Dithyr.*16) we find instances of poems metaphorically traveling to their intended place of performance, and the issue of whether this meant the poet was traveling with them is still hotly debated.[40]

39 See on this topic in particular the article by Selden (1998).

40 On metaphors of travel in Pindar, see, e.g., Calame (2012) 303–312.

Epilogue

That this kind of poetic travel could be so successful as to ultimately eclipse authentic autochthonous traditions on their own home ground is the implication of the final passage I wish to discuss briefly, from the anonymous late Hellenistic *Epitaphius Bionis*:

> πᾶσα, Βίων, θρηνεῖ σε κλυτὰ πόλις, ἄστεα πάντα.
> Ἄσκρα μὲν γοάει σε πολὺ πλέον Ἡσιόδοιο·
> Πίνδαρον οὐ ποθέοντι τόσον Βοιωτίδες ὗλαι·
> οὐ τόσον Ἀλκαίω περιμύρατο Λέσβος ἐραννά,
> οὐδὲ τόσον τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὀδύρατο Τήιον ἄστυ·
> σὲ πλέον Ἀρχιλόχοιο ποθεῖ Πάρος, ἀντὶ δὲ Σαπφοῦς
> εἰσέτι σεῦ τὸ μέλισμα κινύρεται ἁ Μιτυλήνα
>
> Each renowned city, Bion, all towns mourn you. Ascra bewails you much more than Hesiod, nor do the Boiotian woods long so much for Pindar, nor does lovely Lesbos cry so much for Alcaeus, nor does the Tean town so grieve for its singer. Paros longs for you more than for Archilochus and instead of Sappho's lament, Mitylene still keens your song.

Bion, called "The *Doric* Orpheus" (18) because of his Sicilian origins, is lamented here in Theocritean centos like Daphnis in Theocritus' *Idyll* 1, not only by the Muses, the gods of poetry, nature, and bucolic characters, but also, surprisingly, by every Greek city with a respectable literary tradition. Indeed, each of these cities is claimed to be sadder about Bion's death than about that of their own poetic offspring. This may be taken to imply that the author of this poem feels that Bion's bucolic song beats all other poets at their own game; a rather grotesque claim. And in case anyone was wondering where Homer is in all this; he is described as having been lamented at his death by his mother Mele (*Song*), who is now invited to mourn *her other son, his equal,* Bion (70–75). Authenticity is here configured in a paradoxical way: although his *imitation* of Theocritus is openly acknowledged, Bion is presented as (one of) the greatest poet(s) who ever lived, one whose death causes more grief to the great poetic cities of the Greek world than that of any of the canonic authors. It looks suspiciously like an attempt at canonization, in fact. If this is perhaps not the most sophisticated way to claim authenticity in the face of autochthonous traditions, it must surely be one of the most brazen ones we may find in Greek literature.

Bibliography

Acosta Hughes, B. 2002. *Polyeideia: The "Iambi" of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley.

Beckby, H. 1958. *Anthologia Graeca, Griechisch-Deutsch*. Munich.

Bing, P. 1988. *The Well-read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*. Göttingen.

Bulloch, A.W. 1989. "Hellenistic Poetry." In *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. 1 Greek Literature, ed. P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox, 541–621. Cambridge.

Calame, C. 2012. "Metaphorical Travel and ritual performance in Epinician Poetry." In *Reading the Victory Ode*, ed. P. Agócs, C. Carey, and R. Rawles, 303–320. Cambridge.

Clay, D. 2004. *Archilochos Heros: The Cult of the Poets in the Greek Polis*. Washington.

Fantuzzi, M., and R. Hunter. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.

Gow, A.S.F., and D.L. Page. 1965. *The Hellenistic Epigrams, vols I: Text and II: Commentary*. Cambridge.

Gutzwiller, K. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley.

Henderson, J. 2007. "The Hocus of a Hedgehog: Ion's Versatility." In *The World of Ion of Chios*, ed. V. Jennings and A. Katsaros, 14–44. Leiden.

Hopkinson, N. 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge.

Hunter, R. 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*. Cambridge.

Hunter, R. 1997. "(B)ionic Man: Callimachus' Iambic programme." *PCPS* 43: 41–52.

Kerkhecker, A. 1999. *Callimachus' Book of* Iambi. Oxford.

Krevans, N. 1983. "Geography and the Literary Tradition in Theocritus 7." *TAPA* 113: 201–220.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1963. "The Seal of Posidippus." *JHS* 83: 75–99.

Palumbo Stracca, B. 1993. *Teocrito: Idilli e Epigrammi*. Milan.

Pfeiffer, R. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship, Vol 1, From the Beginnings to the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.

Reitzenstein, R. 1893. *Epigramm und Skolion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte alexandrinischer Dichtung*. Hildesheim.

Rossi, L.E. 1971. "I generi letterari e le loro legge scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche." *BICS* 18: 69–94.

Scodel, R. 1987. "Horace, Lucilius and Callimachean Polemic." HSCP 91: 199–215.

Selden, D. 1998. "Alibis." *CA* 17: 289–412.

Treu, M. 1963. "Selbstzeugnisse alexandrinischer Dichter (Kallimachos 13. Iambos Theokrit XVI)." In *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni*, 273–290. Turin.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von 1913. *Sappho und Simonides*. Berlin.

CHAPTER 7

Embedded Song and Poetic Authority in Pindar and Bacchylides

Sarah J. Harden

Pindar *Nemean* 5 (*N.* 5) and Bacchylides 13 (B. 13) both contain extended embedded songs: in *N.* 5 the Muses are depicted singing on Pelion, while Bacchylides depicts the song of an Aeginetan maiden-chorus.[1] This is in itself remarkable, for extended inset song is not common in extant epinician, although references to internal choruses do occur elsewhere, such as *P.* 1.1–4, where the Muses dance to the lyre.[2] Power's discussion of B. 13 gives six examples of references to choruses within epinician poetry, of which *N.* 5 is one.[3] However, as this chapter will show, there is a difference between an internal chorus that is mentioned only briefly in one or two lines (the majority of Power's examples) and one which is given not only detailed contextual description, but also its own voice to speak within the poem, since the content of the embedded song may reflect on or conflict with that of the main poem in a much more significant way than in an abbreviated depiction of song-

1 I use the term "embedded song" to refer to the depiction of a performance of poetry within a poem, such as the songs of Demodocus in *Od.* 8—the length, content, and even the style of narration (i.e. whether it is reported in direct or indirect discourse) varies widely across the different genres of Greek literature, but the essential component in the motif for the purposes of this discussion is the explicit depiction of the performance of a *song* as opposed to the embedded narration of a story in ordinary speech (although of course such embedded narrations may share many of the features of song). In this approach I am adapting the concept of 'embedded story' in de Jong (2001) xiii, which is used for any story embedded in the main narrative of a work of literature: embedded song seems to me to be an important sub-set of this wider narratological category. Cf. Thomas (2014) 89–102 for a more musical view (focusing on Phemius in *Odyssey* 1); Harden (forthcoming) discusses the concept of embedded song in Greek literature from Homer to Callimachus.

2 Although extended inset song is fairly unusual in epinician, there are many undeveloped references to song itself, and descriptions of the power of song on its listeners: Pindar *Ol.* 8.54, 10.76–77, *P.* 1.97, 3.17–19, 77–79 (effect of song on an audience). Bacchylides 1.1–3 (admittedly fragmentary) seems to refer to the Muses singing or creating the current ode, B.2.11–14 again depicts the Muse performing the victory ode at hand.

3 Power (2000) 68–69; the other examples are *P.* 10.38–39, *Ol.* 4.2–4, 14.9, and B.11.112.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_009

performance. This chapter will show that interaction between the embedded song (both in terms of content and performer) and the frame narrative in these two epinician poems is a major means by which both poets create a sense of their own authority.

Scholarship on these poems has tended to focus on a strongly socio-functional interpretation of the embedded songs. For instance, Bacchylides' chorus of *parthenoi* has been explained as a "naturalizing" force within the poem, which brings epinician as a genre, as well as the victor, within the socially acceptable and ritual context of religious choral festival.[4] Other critics have analyzed the embedded songs with too little focus on their surrounding poetic context: Burnett reads the Muses' song in *N.* 5 as "a vulgar folk tale set to music," but fails to take account of the many subtle links between the inset chorus and the first-person narrator text.[5] Pfeijffer seeks to limit the function of embedded song in choral lyric in contrast with earlier examples of the technique in Greek poetry: "Whereas the epic poets may use secondary narratives as a vehicle for introducing narrative material that is alien to the main storyline, the poets of victory odes tend to use secondary narrators to manipulate narrative time."[6] Thus, for Pfeijffer, the function of the inset song in these two odes would be explicable largely through a desire for narrative economy.

Given the primary function of epinician to commemorate and praise, we should consider the possibility that embedded song could function as a strategy of praise and explore the effect(s) of an internal narrator on this rhetorical function of epinician. An important element in the epinician poet's depiction of the victor is the creation of an authoritative poet-narrator, connected to the Muses, whose praise is thereby intimated to be highly valuable as well as credible.

Embedded song is used elsewhere in Greek literature to increase the poet's authority, often by association with divine performers or the divine invention of song, genre, or music.[7] Even the songs of Demodocus, which do serve to manipulate narrative time, implicitly increase the authority and prestige of the poet of the *Odyssey*, for Demodocus, a singer like the narrator, is presented as an honored figure within the ideal city of the Phaeacians, a singer with a special relationship with the Muses, and a man whose knowledge of the epic past and also

---

4 Power (2000) 67–81; Fearn (2007) 87–160.

5 Burnett (2005) 57–76.

6 Pfeijffer (2004) 226. Agócs (2009) 35, 77 also ascribes this role to what he terms "mise en abyme" in Pindar. I prefer to use the term "mise en abyme" only for those embedded songs which reflect the frame narrative as a whole, rather than for all embedded songs regardless of their subject matter. Cf. de Jong (1985) 18 n. 1.

7 Cf. Harden and Kelly (2013) 1–34.

of divine matters is unrivalled. Along with more overt invocations to the Muses, embedded songs are one of the main strategies by which the Homeric narrator obtains authority, for he does not intrude on the narrative with self-characterization or claims about his own excellence.[8] Hesiod, of course, characterizes his narrator more fully, but in the *Theogony* this is confined to the proem, where his self-referential *Dichterweihe* is combined with extensive use of embedded song to prove his connection with the Muses and his authority as a poet.[9] The *Homeric Hymns*' formulaic beginnings and endings contain first-person addresses to the gods and invocations of the Muse which are comparable to the invocations of the Muse found at the beginning of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but they do not offer extensive characterization of the narrator(s) of these poems.

Pindar's epinician narrator, on the other hand (and to a lesser extent those of Bacchylides), is far from self-effacing.[10] No-one would deny that we very often find in Pindar's epinicians an authoritative poet-narrator who directly adduces his connection with the Muses, his poetic skill, his remit to praise, and his fitness for poetic purpose.[11] Bacchylides, although he refers to himself as poet less often and less emphatically than Pindar, is not reticent about his own poetic excellence.[12] Granted, both poets emphasize their poet-narrators' close connection with the Muses, but the speakers of Pindar's poems in particular also adduce an independent poetic authority, achieved through moralizing statements and claims to excellence.[13] The increased directness about the poetic

8 The Homeric narrator has attracted much scholarly attention. Cf. de Jong (2004) 13–24 (a useful summary with further bibliography); de Jong (1987); Richardson (1990).

9 Cf. inter alia Nünlist (2004) 25–34; Scodel (2001) 109–137; Stoddard (2004) 60–84, esp. 66–67.

10 For a discussion of the authority of the Pindaric narrator, see Morrison (2007) 84–90.

11 Cf. Pindar *Ol.* 3.3–6, where the poet claims the Muse stands beside him and that song is the greatest reward for athletic success; *Ol.* 4.2–4 Pindar portrays himself as the messenger of the *Horai* in delivering his song. The frequent first-person references in Pindar (e.g. *Ol.* 7.14 κατέβαν, 16 αἰνέσω, 20 ἐθελήσω; *Ol.* 1.115b–end) also set his narratorial style apart from that of Homer. Cf. Lefkowitz (1991) 25–43 for the "bardic I" in Pindar's odes.

12 Cf. B. 4.7–9, where B. refers to himself as the "sweet-voiced cock of Urania," in 5.14 he self-styles as the "famous servant of Urania of the golden hair-band," B. 9.2–3 "the god-inspired spokesman of the violet-eyed Muses." See too Carey (1999) 18 "The poet's greatness, and with it his authority, is a given for Bacchylides as it is for Pindar."

13 For the Muses in Pindar, see Gianotti (1975) 41–68 and Lanata (1963) 74–97. For narratorial authority created by gnomic statements and not by evocation of the Muse, see Scodel (2001) 123 "Pindar constantly invokes and evokes the Muses. Yet in his epinicia he never cites them as an authority for his versions of a story or for any other point of truth." Cf. also Carey (1995) 97–98.

procedure (seen in the constant references to the performance of the current song which occur in every Pindaric ode) may limit the need for embedded song as a mirror for the poet's work, since the poet-narrator often refers directly to the quality of his song. This may offer an explanation for the relative rarity of extended embedded songs in the epinician corpus in contrast with the extant hexameter poems, although the frequency of very abbreviated descriptions of choral song (noted above) suggests an interest in the motif, albeit in a syncopated form.

Pindar, *Nemean* 5: Divine Praise

Before the chorus of Muses even begin their song, Pindar has indicated that song itself is a major theme of this poem, and it is vital that the context of this embedded song within *Nemean* 5 is discussed in order to fully interpret its significance and understand its function as a means of generating poetic authority.[14]

At line 13b, after detailing the achievement of Pytheas and praising Aegina, Pindar turns to the subject of song, or rather what is and is not a desirable subject for poetry. A mythical narrative about the Aeacids is rejected on grounds of propriety. The speaker mentions the event elliptically, signaling his unease at the subject-matter (αἰδέομαι 13b), before alluding to the murder of Phocus in very vague terms. The deed itself is presented as morally ambiguous (ἐν δίκᾳ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον 14), and the poet avoids mentioning any proper names, so Aegina is the "glorious island" (εὐκλέα νᾶσον 15) and the murderers, Peleus and Telamon, are simply "mighty men" (ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους 15).[15] The strong first-person statement of 13 is paralleled in στάσομαι at the beginning of line 16, which bold claim ("I will stand still") could be read as referring both to the words of the poem and the physical motion of the dance which would have

14 Previous treatments of this ode, such as that of Pfeijffer (2004) 230–231 have interpreted the song of the Muses without due consideration of the frame narrative; in his otherwise thorough and valuable narratological analysis of the embedded song in *N.* 5 there is little said on the links between the Muses' song and the lines which precede it.

15 For Burnett (2005) 67–68, the silence of the poet does not necessarily indicate moral disapproval: "The sung words contain no syllable that condemns Peleus and Telamon." However, the use of the word αἰδέομαι at line 13 and the fact that the poet does not in fact treat the myth in detail suggests that Pindar is here aware that some subjects (such as fratricide) are not suitable for his genre: if Peleus is the mythical comparandum for the *laudandus*, then the poet must tell a story which brings glory on both men.

accompanied it. The speaker here calls an abrupt halt to proceedings, and furthermore adds a gnomic statement extolling the virtues of silence (καὶ τὸ σιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐστὶ σοφώτατον ἀνθρώπῳ νοῆσαι 18).[16] So, the narrator tells us directly that he shrinks from telling an unflattering tale of fratricide from Aeginetan myth (hinted at in the preceding lines of the ode, 10–13) and, after a gnomic statement extolling discretion (albeit only in certain circumstances), the narrator gives an account of his preferred subjects for poetry: praising happiness (ὄλβον), physical strength (χειρῶν βίαν), and war (πόλεμον). These lines (19–21) are the reverse image of the previous section (which dealt with unsuitable topics of song), and in contrast to the stunted silence of 16–18, the imagery here invokes the power of the poet. He is first compared to a successful athlete, able to overcome a strenuous physical challenge (ἔχω γονάτων ὁρμὰν ἐλαφράν 20) then imagined as an eagle soaring over the sea (καὶ πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί 21) which recalls the sea-faring *aoidoi* of the opening lines, and claims international appeal for poetry once again.

So what should we make of this in connection with the subsequent song of the Muses? These last lines (19–21) give us a reason for the speaker's earlier reticence: by setting out the ideal or preferred subjects for his song the narrator implies that it is the epinician poem's genre, its remit to praise, which makes the Aeacid fratricide an uncomfortable topic. This is made clear by the strong contrast between the fratricide and the three preferred topics of 19–21—the murder leaves the narrator ashamed and static (αἰδέομαι 14 and στάσομαι 16), while the war, happiness and athletic prowess of 19–20 inspire him to great heights of poetry.

However, when read in the hindsight of the Muses' song, these first-person statements at 14 and 16, referring respectively to the speaker's shame and his verbal (and even physical) paralysis regarding the story of Phocus suggest that it is not only concerns of genre which affect what can and cannot be told in a poem. In his cautious treatment of the Phocus myth, the poet sets up the idea that some stories have a pernicious quality in the mouth of the wrong speaker, as well as when told in the wrong context. Having rejected Phocus' story as inappropriate, he is supplanted by internal narrators who sing a myth which seems in some ways just as inappropriate: the story of a young Peleus' encounter with a sexual predator. The Muses' authority as the divine source of poetry guarantees the acceptability of the story in an epinician, or indeed in any poem. We might compare the famous passage from *Ol.* 1.47–51,

16 For the poet as a "moralizer" in this respect, see Morrison (2007) 68–69; Maehler (1982) 92; Fogelmark (1979) 72; Bundy (1986) 64. Hunter (2008) 119–120 discusses this type of reticence in the Hellenistic poets.

where the traditional but gorier tale of Tantalus' cannibal feast is relegated to the mouth of a jealous neighbor, while the speaker holds himself aloof from such subject-matter: again we find a strong first-person statement (ἀφίσταμαι *Ol.*1.52), and the same issues of genre-appropriate material are clearly in play. Before the Muses even enter, then, the speaker has made clear his interest in the construction of, and even the ethics of, poetry.

This disingenuous refusal to treat inappropriate subject-matter, which has been interpreted as arising from the poem's spontaneity (i.e. lack of artistic planning), is actually used in a sophisticated, self-conscious manner as the poet plays with his audience and their knowledge of Aegina's traditional myths.[17] He displays his own knowledge of the island's mythic history by referring obliquely to a famous story, but titillates his listeners by refusing to go into details. It is crucial that these self-conscious themes of the poem are recognized as the background for the embedded song that follows, printed in full below:

πρόφρων δὲ καὶ κείνοις ἄειδ' ἐν Παλίῳ
Μοισᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορός, ἐν δὲ μέσαις
φόρμιγγ' Ἀπόλλων ἑπτάγλωσσον
  χρυσέῳ πλάκτρῳ διώκων
—
ἁγεῖτο παντοίων νόμων· αἱ δὲ πρώτιστον μὲν ὕμνη-
  σαν Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι σεμνὰν Θέτιν
Πηλέα θ', ὥς τέ νιν ἁβρὰ
  Κρηθεῖς Ἱππολύτα δόλῳ πεδᾶσαι
ἤθελε ξυνᾶνα Μαγνήτων σκοπόν
πείσαισ' ἀκοίταν ποικίλοις βουλεύμασιν,
ψεύσταν δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε λόγον,
ὡς ἦρα νυμφείας ἐπείρα
  κεῖνος ἐν λέκτροις Ἀκάστου
—
εὐνᾶς· τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ἔσκεν· πολλὰ γάρ νιν παντὶ θυμῷ
παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν.
  τοῖο δ' ὀργὰν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι·
εὐθὺς δ' ἀπανάνατο νύμφαν,
  ξεινίου πατρὸς χόλον
δείσαις· ὁ δ' εὖ φράσθη κατένευ-
  σέν τέ οἱ ὀρσινεφὴς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ

17 Finley (1955) 47, whose views are updated by Morrison (2007) 67–73, by what he terms (artful) "pseudo-spontaneity."

Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεύς, ὥστ' ἐν τάχει
ποντίαν χρυσαλακάτων τινὰ Νη-
ρεΐδων πράξειν ἄκοιτιν,

—

γαμβρὸν Ποσειδάωνα πείσαις, ὃς Αἰγᾶθεν ποτὶ κλει-
τὰν θαμὰ νίσεται Ἰσθμὸν Δωρίαν·
ἔνθα νιν εὔφρονες ἶλαι
σὺν καλάμοιο βοᾷ θεὸν δέκονται,
καὶ σθένει γυίων ἐρίζοντι θρασεῖ.
πότμος δὲ κρίνει συγγενὴς ἔργων πέρι
πάντων. τὺ δ' Αἰγίναθε δίς, Εὐθύμενες,
νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων
ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων.

—

ἤτοι μεταΐξαις σὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει
κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα.

This song is performed by a chorus of Muses singing on Mount Pelion and forms the mythic narrative section of the poem.[18] The scene is a κάλλιστος χορός of the Muses, with Apollo as accompanist and *choregos*.[19] It is usually interpreted by modern critics as the performance of the Muses at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, which Pindar mentions elsewhere (*P.* 3.88–92).[20] The Muses sing more than one kind of song: their *prooimion* to Zeus and its continuation into a narrative about Thetis (25–26) suggests a hymnic performance, while the part of their song given in most detail is a heroic narrative concerning mortals, namely the story of the wife of Acastus and her attempted seduction of Peleus. The implication is that successful mortals are as popular a subject-matter as gods for the Muses' songs.

The very presence of the Muses' performance in this poem has positive implications for the authority of the poet-narrator. Like Hesiod in the proem of the *Theogony*, Pindar knows what the Muses sing and is able to report it in

18 For the status of myth in the epinician genre, cf. Hutchinson (2001) 367–368. The scholia ad *N.* 5.46a (= Drachmann (1927) 94) note the song of the Muses and discuss the fact that they take their proem from Zeus, but do not go any further in discussing the embedding of this song.

19 For a discussion of the choral representation of the Muses in *N.* 5, see Nagy (1990) 355.

20 Thus Burnett (2005) 70; Fogelmark (1979) 73; Fennell (1899) 62; Farnell (1932) 276; Bury (1890) 85. Cf. Robbins (1987) 29 for an acknowledgement that this location for the Muses' is in fact not mentioned in *Nemean* 5 itself: "no doubt at Peleus' wedding (though we are not specifically told this)."

his own poem, implying a close relationship with the patrons of poetry. This relationship is deepened by the layering of their song into his own: unlike, for instance the songs of Demodocus in the *Odyssey* (which are narratologically digressive in nature, although they contain important resonances with the frame narrative), the Muses' song is structurally integral to the epinican ode since their performance on Pelion functions as the mythical narrative section in the current praise poem for Pytheas.[21] Its effect is a blending of poetic voices which reflects positively on victor and poet alike.

Given that the poet hands over his narratorial role to the Muses having just heralded his own inability to sing of inappropriate topics, we might well ask whether the Muses' song is any more appropriate than the rejected myth of Phocus. Their song has been accused of being unfit for epinician, dealing as it does with the "immoral" sexual exploits of Hippolyta.[22] In particular, Burnett has argued that the song is highly inappropriate, and that its un-martial context undermines Peleus' status as a hero. For her the contest is "an indecent one that pits a lusty and scheming female against an immature youth who has no chance to show heroic courage."[23] If thus characterized, the embedded myth of Peleus, who functions here as a mythical exemplum for the *laudandus*, is ineffective: it fails to cast a positive light on the victor and in fact narrates a shameful episode from his country's mythical past, the very thing that the narrator shrank from doing in lines 14–21. This would be a serious charge, and a fundamental mark of failure on Pindar's part, but it may be possible to rehabilitate this song from such an accusation.

The juxtaposition of the Muses' song to the poet's discussion of what he may and may not sing implies an awareness of the difference between mortal and immortal speakers. The reluctance of the poet to speak of things unlawful (14–18) is not applicable to the internal choir of the Muses. While silence may be wiser for *mortals* (καὶ τὸ σιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐστὶ σοφώτατον ἀνθρώπῳ νοῆσαι 18) it is not so for divinities, who sing all kinds of *nomoi* (παντοίων νόμων 25).[24] Moreover, while the repressed story of Phocus' murder contains the crime of a hero, the story of Hippolyta and Peleus does not—it is not the hero who is at fault here; in fact his respect for the laws of *xenia* is praiseworthy and

21 There is a vast bibliography on this issue in the *Odyssey*: as a beginning cf. de Jong (2001) 206–209, Burkert (1960) 130–144, Alden (1997) 513–529, Olson (1989) 135–145, and Newton (1987).

22 Burnett (2005) 70–76; Fennell (1899) 56.

23 Burnett (2005) 71.

24 Nagy (1990) 355–356 argues persuasively that the *nomoi* of *Nemean* 5.25 refer to the Muses' songs and not to Apollo's music.

gains him reward from Zeus (34–35). It is also unsatisfactory to argue that the song is unheroic because it does not display "strength of arm or yet soldierly skill."[25] This display of restraint in the face of unlawful temptation is a theme which recurs throughout Greek literature.[26] Euripides' Hippolytus is no less a hero because his story is one of the rejection of incest: what would make him less of a hero is succumbing to unlawful passions. So it is in Pindar. The story of Peleus and Hippolyta functions here as a cautionary tale, warning the young victor that his success will bring advances from unsuitable women, but lawful, divinely sanctioned marriage is the only acceptable path.[27] As glorious marriage is Peleus' reward, so it may be the reward of athletic victory.[28] Indeed Pindar elsewhere links marriage and athletic victory, as in *Ol.* 1, where the two are physically merged in the tale of Pelops snatching Hippodameia in his victorious chariot race.[29]

The Muses lend their authority as the source of poetry to another aspect of the mythical tale.[30] This particular story, in which Peleus' marriage to Thetis is directly motivated by his repudiation of Hippolyta, is almost certainly a Pindaric innovation.[31] At *Nemean* 4.48–65 the Hippolyta episode is mentioned

25 Burnett (2005) 71.

26 For instance Bellerophon (*Il.* 6.160–205) and the Hippolytus myth. See Stern (1971) 69 and Lesky (1937) 26–30.

27 Gärtner (1978) 39–40 argues for a biographical motivation for the story of Peleus and Thetis—that Pindar has included it because it reflects the marital circumstances of the victor's father, whom he postulates is married to a woman of higher status than himself. Such a historical interpretation can only ever remain speculation and, moreover, seems hardly likely to please the victor (which is surely the strongest objection against such a reading).

28 Cf. (for a slightly different slant on the marriage-theme in epinician) Burnett (2005) 75: "This sequence is meant to remind Pytheas and his chorus that the purpose of marriage is … the transfer of an inherited, divinely determined and success-bearing fate from one generation to the next."

29 On the play between tradition and innovation in this poem, see Scodel (2001) 128–129. Cf. also *Pythian* 9, where success in the race leads Alexidamas to marriage inside the myth, while outside it the emphasis is on the women of Cyrene waiting for Telesicrates to come home (95–100). Carne-Ross (1985) 26–30 discusses this link between sexual language and the language of victory in epinician.

30 If my argument here is accepted, this instance would provide an exception to the comment of Scodel (2001) 123: "Yet in his epinicia [Pindar] never cites the [Muses] as an authority for his versions of a story or for any other point of truth."

31 Stoneman (1981) 61: "it seems to me typical of the kind of change Pindar makes in his myths: it elevates the moral character of the hero if he receives his bride, not through the arbitrary goodwill of Hera, but directly as a reward for his actions."

but not directly linked with the marriage of Peleus and Thetis as it is in *Nemean* 5; rather, it forms part of a sequence of events culminating in the wrestling match with Thetis which results in her rape and subsequent marriage. The more usual motivation for the marriage between Thetis and Peleus in myth is the impossibility of a marriage between Zeus and Thetis, either because of Thetis' respect for Hera, or because Zeus fears a prophecy that Thetis' son will be greater than his father.[32] Pindar's representation of the winning of a glorious marriage through piety and restraint changes the motivation of the action from one of divine prerogative to human excellence, the key theme in any victory ode.[33] Pindar's innovation here is validated by the choice of narrator for the embedded song: by presenting it in the mouths of the Muses the poet gives credibility to his new myth and to his choice to play down the divine element of the traditional story. Moreover the location of the performance, at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, gives his version of the myth temporal priority, since the song of the Muses is thus presented as the first poetic account of the winning of Thetis, giving it the additional authority of being the story's earliest version.

Structure

The song of the Muses is introduced with the verb ἄειδ' in line 22, and their chorus and location on Pelion are described, along with Apollo's lyre-playing (23–25) before the subject of their song is given in detail. At line 25, another verb of singing introduces their performance (ὕμνησαν) and finally the story of Hippolyta begins with the introductory ὡς in line 26. At the beginning of the Muses' performance, then, we are left in little doubt as to the speaker(s) of the *prooimion* to Zeus, the unelaborated story of Thetis and the Peleus-Hippolyta story. In contrast to this carefully delineated opening, the Muses' song has no explicitly marked ending. After this ὡς at line 26 there are no further markers of

32 Pfeijffer (1999) 74: "According to the traditional story … Thetis was given to Peleus because of certain inconvenient, sensitive issues in Olympian politics." Although Pfeijffer bases his evidence that the Themis-version of the story was more traditional on later sources (Apollodorus 3.13.5 and Apollonius Rhodius 4.790–804), there are hints of this version in earlier texts, cf. *Cypria* fr. 2 = Hesiod fr. 210 (Merkelbach-West) where the motivation for the marriage in *Cypria* and Hesiod is said to be that Zeus was angry at Thetis' refusal of him. For a detailed discussion of the mythic background see Slatkin (2011): 85–105.

33 Burnett (2005) 71 sees Peleus' actions in the myth as "a disappointment" and comments "The ultimate blessedness of the wedding on Pelion has thus been won by mere discretion."

indirect discourse, allowing the Muses' song to blend seamlessly with the rest of the ode so that it is very difficult to draw a line between the end of their song and the return to first-person, authorial, narration.[34] The actions of Zeus at the end of the second triad (up until line 36) are firmly part of the mythical narrative, telling of Peleus' reward for his piety, but with the beginning of the third triad, the transition between mythical narrative and a return to the present (and praise of the victor's family) is effected by means of a relative clause linking Poseidon as a character in the Peleus-Thetis story to the cult figure of Poseidon at the Isthmian games; a gnomic statement about inherited victory follows, then a direct reference to the victory of Euthymenes in the games.[35]

This associative structure blurs the voices of primary and reported narrators: we might feel certain that by lines 45–46, where we have a return to the first-person singular in χαίρω, the primary narrator is speaking again. But before that, it is difficult to say precisely where the Muses stop speaking and Pindar begins: is it at the relative clause? The gnomic statement? The account of Euthymenes' victories? After that, even? This indeterminacy reflects the authority of the Muses onto the primary narrator. He not only claims to know and to be able to report what the Muses sang in the mythical past (a technique familiar from the early Greek hexameter poets and one which would increase his poetic authority in any case), but appropriates their voice for his praise poetry.[36] The blurring between narratorial voices has the effect of imply-

34 Gärtner (1978) 36 suggests that the Muses' song ends at line 39, while Robbins (1987) 29 argues for line 37 on the grounds that it would be "oddly anachronistic to have the Muses singing of the Isthmian games at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis"—I would argue that such a slippage of time is exactly what Pindar is trying to achieve with the inset song. Burnett (2005) 72 argues that the Muses' song ends at line 38. Cf. too Stern (1971) 173; Pfeijffer (2004) 230; Fera (2000) 144. Bury (1890) 85–86 notes the blending at both beginning and end of the Muses' song: "thus the connexion of thought is really close between lines 21 and 22; there is not, as at first might appear, a break and a fresh start" … "the peals of Apollo's lyre pass suddenly into the sounds of the flutes which greet the coming of the sea-king to his Isthmian games."

35 Bury (1890) 86 notes the suddenness of the transition from mythical narrative to praise of the victor's family but does not comment further. Cf. Burnett (2005) 72.

36 Pfeijffer (1999) 72 rather sees the chorus of Muses merging with the "Aeginetan" chorus who performed the ode: "By creating the illusion that the Muses are still singing when the victories are mentioned, the Aeginetan chorus performing the present ode merges with the chorus of the Muses: it as [sic] singing for Pytheas and his family just as the chorus of Muses sang for Peleus." In the absence of any evidence for such a chorus, and the presence of a strongly characterized primary narrator, I prefer to see the exchange of authority in the terms I have set out above.

ing divine interest in the victory of Pytheas, who thus has a chorus not only of humans, but of goddesses hymning his triumph.

Pindar's use of a divine chorus, then, may be seen as a strategy of praise for his victor, and as a device to increase his own poetic authority by setting him at the pinnacle of his profession, since he (like Hesiod before him) claims to know what the Muses have sung and even dares to blend his own voice with theirs. As we shall see in the next section, Bacchylides, in his poem for the same victor, also augments his voice with that of an internal narrator, but he chooses quite a different sort of chorus.

Bacchylides 13: Human Praise

In his 13th poem, Bacchylides presents a chorus of Aeginetan maidens who sing, like the Muses in *N.* 5, a mythical narrative. As Pindar's chorus of Muses was foreshadowed in *N.* 5 with several self-conscious reflections on song, so too Bacchylides introduces song as a vital theme of his poem long before the maidens are depicted. The poem's beginning is lost, but it is possible to hypothesize a prophecy or similar pronouncement that serves to link the *pankration*, the event in which Pytheas (the *laudandus*) is victor, with a Herculean labor, the defeat of the Nemean lion.[37] At line 67, the poet turns to the present day and the benefits of Pytheas' victory in his home city; he is garlanded with flowers and, more significantly, with song, as his city is rich in soft-voiced revels (ἁβ̣[ροθρ]όων κώμ̣[ων] 73–74), specifically in honor of his distinction in the pankration (ὑπέρβι[ον] ἰσχύν παμμαχίαν ἄνα φαίνων 75–76). These songs in honor of a victory in the games, which are described as pleasant to hear (τε]ρψιμ̣[β]ρ̣ότων 72), immediately recall the victory ode in progress and signal song and the role of song in celebrating the victor as a theme in the poem. Already in this depiction of the victor, crowned with flowers and celebrated by his fellow-citizens, there is a focus on human praise and civic song as a means of honor, rather than the divine song which was used to honor Pytheas in *N.* 5.

This theme is signalled again a few lines later where a proud maiden (ὑψαυχὴς κό<ρα 84) is depicted singing of Aegina, the victor's hometown. The physical details of the girl's performance are dwelt on: her feet are mentioned (πόδεσσι ταρφέως 86), and she is compared to a fawn (ἠΰτε νεβρὸς ἀπεν[θὴς 87). The song

37 Cf. Cairns (2010) 300, also Maehler (1982) ad loc. and Jebb (1905) ad loc. for their reconstructions and suggestions.

is choral, for she is joined by local girls (ἀγχιδόμ̣[οις] … ἑταίρα]ις 89–90). They are all garlanded as if for a festival (στεφανωσάμε[ναι φοιν]ι̣κ̣έων ἀνθέων 91–92), with the particular detail that the flowers are local (ἐ[πιχω]ρίαν ἄθυρσιν 92–93), which gives emphasis to the poem's Aeginetan tone.[38]

The song of the maidens does not have a secure endpoint within the text, although this could of course be due to the fragmentary nature of the poem rather than any deliberate poetic strategy. The certain portion of their song, plus the (possible) transition from their embedded song back to the voice of the primary narrator, is printed in full below:[39]

τό γε σὸν̣ [κλέος αἰ]νεῖ
καί τις ὑψαυχὴς κό[ρα –]
[– –⏑⏑ –⏑⏑] ραν πό-
δεσσι ταρφέως
ἠΰτε νεβρὸς ἀπεν[θὴς]
ἀνθεμόεντας ἐπ[' ὄχθους]
κοῦφα σὺν ἀγχιδόμ[οις] θρῴσ-
κουσ' ἀγακλειτα[ῖς ἑταίρα]ις·
ταὶ δὲ στεφανωσάμε[ναι φοιν]ικέων
ἀνθέων δόνακός τ' ἐ[πιχω]ρί-
αν ἄθυρσιν
παρθένοι μέλπουσι τ[........]ς, ὦ
δέσποινα παγξε[ίνου χθονός,]
['Εν]δαΐδα τε ῥοδό[παχυν,]
ἃ τὸ[ν ἰσ]ό[θε]ον ἔτι[κτεν Πηλέα]
καὶ Τελαμ[ῶ]να [κο]ρυ[στὰν]
Αἰακῷ μιχθεῖσ' ἐν εὐ[νᾷ·]
τῶν υἷας ἀερσιμάχ[ους,]
ταχύν τ' Ἀχιλλέα
εὐειδέος τ' Ἐριβοίας
παῖδ' ὑπέρθυμον βοά[σω]

B. 13.83–103

38 Cairns (2010) 303 takes the girls' song as evidence of a 'traditional' performance in Aegina; cf. also 304 n. 87–89, where he says it "no doubt reflects Aeginetan tradition," but there is no evidence for this in the poem—the girls' performance may be the poet's invention.

39 The text of Bacchylides throughout is that of Snell and Maehler (1992) (hereafter S-M); any changes to their edition are indicated in the notes.

The maiden whose description introduces the song should probably be understood as a universal, rather than specific, figure. Such an interpretation increases the value of her praise, for it implies that "many a maiden" sings the praises of Aegina, rather than one single girl.[40] The topic of the girl's song is introduced before she herself is described (τό γε σὸν [κλέος αἰ]νεῖ καί τις ὑψαυχὴς κό[ρα—] 83–84), and thus the emphasis is placed firmly on Aegina rather than on the performer. The song's exposition is delayed by a description of the proud maiden, the chorus which accompanies her, and the location of their performance—a flowery, bucolic landscape (87–90). She and her chorus of local girls sing of Aeacus, son of Aegina and his union with Endais, which resulted in the heroic sons Peleus and Telamon. Their song forms part of the mythical narrative of the ode, setting the victor's achievement in the context of the glorious mythical past of the island where he was born; generically it seems to be a song of heroic genealogy, or (depending on where their song ends) an epic-style narrative prefigured with a genealogical history of the heroes involved.

The significance of the female chorus' presentation here is ambiguous. Power suggests that this sexualization of the *parthenos* chorus presents the female *choregos* as an idealized partner for the victor, and "not as a mirror of the epinician *choregos*."[41] According to Power, the song of the women places them outside the civilized bounds of the city, and the victor must marry the maiden "to reintegrate into the world of the polis the *choregos*, who dances with her chorus outside this space in nature." However, Power also bases his argument on Kurke's theory that the victory ode is intended to reintegrate the victor into society, and it is difficult to see how a song sung by maidens themselves outside the bounds of society could achieve this.[42] In fact, their song is not at all outside the *polis*, but concerns the mythical roots of the city. It is genealogical in tone, beginning with Aegina as mistress and motherland and detailing the succession of glorious children that sprang from Aegina's union with Zeus, going down through the generations. Snell and Maehler's reconstruction of the lacuna in line 61 as referring to the *kleos* of Aegina makes the *polis*-centred tone of the girls' song even clearer.[43] This subject-matter and the emphasis on the girls as local, crowned with local flowers, suggests that the maidens are not wild,

40 For this use of τις in Bacchylides, see Maehler (2004) 143 n. 31–33.

41 Power (2000) 78–80.

42 Power (2000) 77, after Kurke (1991).

43 Fearn (2007) 107 suggests *kratos* to fill this lacuna—after Blass; cf. Jebb (1905: 342), which would have a similar semantic implications—the girls sing of the power of Aegina, not of any peculiarly "female" concerns.

exotic creatures who need to be tamed to be socially acceptable, but rather the voice (or at least one of the voices) of the triumphant *polis* itself.

At line 103 there is a textual crux, the interpretation of which is key to understanding the nature of the maidens' song. The papyrus is broken at the end of line 103, and the line end has been supplemented by Housman (followed by Snell and Maehler, Cairns, Power, and Fearn) as βοά[σω, which changes the speaker from the internal chorus to a first-person narrator.[44] However Jebb (followed by Blass, Jurenka, and Calame) believed that the song of the maidens continued until 190 and offered βοα[θόον as a supplement to line 103 (βοα[τάν Blass).[45] Jebb's reading also requires a minor supplementation to line 100 whereby τῶν υἷας ἀερσιμάχ[ους] becomes τῶν ⟨θ'⟩ υἷας ἀερσιμάχ[ους].[46] Cairns points out that the reading of the papyrus as it stands demands a finite verb at 103, which βοα[σω supplies.[47] To solve this textual problem definitively is impossible given the state of the papyrus, but although it would be of great significance to know how much of the mythical narrative Bacchylides definitively put into the mouth of his maiden chorus, it is not a crushing blow to further interpretation to leave the matter unresolved. For, as we shall see, the thematic and structural links between the song of the maidens and the section of the poem immediately following are striking, so much so that the "Iliadic" myth blurs into the song of the maidens regardless of whether there is a change of speaker or not.

The genealogy of Aegina, begun in the girls' song, is continued at lines 100 f.: the sons of Endais sung by the maidens are the fathers of Achilles and Ajax, whose history is more fully developed. The genealogy leads to an extended praise of her two most famous descendants, and thus there seems to be a unified plot and structure to this mythical narrative despite the question mark over its narrator(s). The girls are described by the poet as praising the *kleos* of Aegina (83), which fits perfectly with a song about Achilles and Ajax, for these two Aeacid heroes are more worthy of such a description than any other descendants, and their prominence in Homer's *Iliad*, a poem which centres on heroic *kleos*, actively associates them with the term. The Iliadic subject-matter of the myth would strongly evoke these associations in the minds of the audience. Indeed, even the maidens' technique is thematically linked to the frame narrative, for their song associates the victor with the mythological

44 Cf. Cairns (2010) 305; Fearn (2007) 107; Power (2000) 73–75; *S-M* 44.

45 Jebb (1905) 343: "it is still the maidens that sing." Cf. *S-M* 44.

46 τῶν ⟨θ'⟩ υἷας cf. Jebb (1905) ad loc.; *S-M* 44. For strong criticism of Jebb's amendment to this line, see Fearn (2007) 117 n. 84.

47 Cairns (2010) 305 n. 100.

past in much the same way as the (now largely fragmentary) opening focuses on Heracles' defeat of the Nemean lion. The close structural and thematic links between the maidens' song and the following Iliadic episode (they form, as one unit, the narrative myth of the poem) have the effect of blurring the narrative voice anyway, creating the polyphonic "city of soft-voiced revels" described by Bacchylides at 72–74.

The mythic section of this poem has been dubbed "the most overtly Homeric of all extant epinician odes."[48] It recounts in ca. 60 lines the basic plot of the *Iliad*, and has a complex time-structure, for although it focuses on an episode arising from the consequences of Achilles' wrath, it tells briefly of the course of the war before the withdrawal of Achilles and prophesies the future destruction of the Trojans when Achilles should return.[49] There is not space or scope here to discuss all the allusions to the Homeric epics in these lines.[50] It will be sufficient for our purposes to note the main epic features of the passage, before turning to the use to which Bacchylides puts epic in this poem. This passage is characterized by frequent use of epic-style epithets (almost 20 in 60 lines): Αἴαντα σακεσφόρον (104), ὀξεῖαν μάχα[ν,] (117), Ἕκτορα χαλ[κεομίτρα]ν (109). An extended epic simile comparing Trojan morale to sailors in a storm takes up 9 lines, and the battle is vividly described with violent imagery (ἔ[ρ]ευθε φώτων [αἵμα]τι γαῖα μέλα[ινα] 152–153), urged on by Apollo and Ares, the gods who support the Trojans in the *Iliad*.

Bacchylides here emphasizes certain factors from the Iliadic source material for his own purposes. The focus is on Ajax and Achilles, two Aeacid heroes, and the only two Iliadic heroes named here which gives an Aeginetan slant to the song. Ajax is painted very much as the key force in the Achaean army during the absence of Achilles, whose withdrawal is represented as devastating to the Greeks, while his return means the ultimate doom of Troy—thus at every stage Aeginetan heroes are key to the progress of the war. The fact that no other Greek hero is mentioned creates the impression that the Trojan War was an Aeacid victory.

As well as this Aeacid focus (obviously motivated by the poem's encomiastic aim), several other features of this episode show connections to lyric poetic themes rather than epic style. So the portrayal of Briseis is eroticized, dwelling on her physical beauty: ξανθᾶς γυναικός (136), [Β]ρ̣[ι]σ̣η̣ΐδος ἱμερογυίου (137). The

48 Fearn (2007) 120.

49 Cairns (2010) 306 n. 105–109 sees the episode as "a single static moment," although this is true of the main action of the myth, the several analepses and the prophetic prolepsis give it a much more dynamic air than Cairns allows.

50 For a detailed discussion see Fearn (2007) 120–143, also Buss (1913) 48–49.

sexual connotation of ἱμερογυίου extends the vision of Briseis in the *Iliad*, where her beauty is mentioned using conventional language but not sexualized.[51]

More significantly, war is linked to athletic victory, for the Trojans plan to celebrate their victory with feasting in the streets and a chorus:[52]

> [στάσειν χ[ο]ρ[ὸ]ν [εἰλα]πίνας τ' ἐν
> [λαοφό]ροις ἕξειν θ[εόδ]ματον πόλιν
> B. 13.162–164

Such civic festivity welcomed Pytheas in Aegina earlier in the poem (69–75), where the poet describes the victor returning to his city, garlanded, to be met with singing and celebrations.

By compressing the story of the *Iliad* into this inset song, Bacchylides offers his victor a miniature epic in his honor and presents Pytheas as one son of Aegina in a succession who have brought glory to the city. He links the achievement of Pytheas with that of Achilles and Ajax and implicitly promises the victor the fame of the two legendary heroes. That the girls who sing the epic are emphasized as Aeginetan adds further depth to the locality of the ode: it is Aeginetan in focus but, like the Homeric epics, will have panhellenic resonance. Like Pindar in *N.* 5, Bacchylides uses his embedded song(s) as a strategy of praise, although he harnesses the parthenaic authority of the maiden chorus and the panhellenic resonance of epic heroism rather than the superlative quality of divine song in order to do so. This song can, of course, also be read as a poetic claim to excellence. Bacchylides takes on Homeric epic and shows his poetic virtuosity: through interaction with and re-interpretation of his poetic heritage he shows he can create something new and uniquely Aeginetan for his victor, a miniature *Iliad* within the praise poem for Pytheas.

As mentioned above, the prevailing tone of scholarship on this poem for the past decade or more has been to read the embedded song primarily in the light of its assumed communitarian function.[53] For such scholars the maiden chorus is a "strategy of inclusion" in a social sense, allowing the victor to be re-integrated into society: "performance by *parthenoi* appears to naturalize and ritualize the epinician praise which needs ideological and ritual frameworks to legitimate its potentially destabilizing power."[54] Such communitarian readings

---

51 Cf. Maehler (1982) on 133–135; Segal (1998) 272–273; Buss (1913) 15.

52 Accepting the supplement of Fearn (2007) 109, 355. Cf. Cairns (2010) 318 n. 162.

53 Power (2000) 67–68; Fearn (2007) 117–118 (N.B. Fearn claims to challenge Power's interpretation but does not seem to me to go much beyond the communitarian reading himself).

54 Fearn (2007) 118.

necessarily over-privilege the chorus' gender in their interpretations of the inset song: the women stand for marriage, and they enable the production of heirs as a socially reintegrating 'next step' for the victor. However, this privileging of epinician's social and cultural status is perhaps over-emphasized, especially when it leads to interpreting embedded song as having only a socio-political function.[55] Most importantly, a strongly communitarian reading of these odes does not take into account the panhellenic appeal and world-wide reperformance scenarios anticipated within the odes themselves, which imply that any immediate social function the odes may have had is seen as secondary to both poet and victor (whose concerns, at least as expressed within the odes, seem to be for commemoration on a much wider scale).[56] Such a reading can thus only provide part of the answer.[57]

In this light, it is worth considering the rarity of extended inset song in extant epinician. Of Power's six further examples of references to internal choruses in this genre, none are given voice in the way that the *parthenoi* and the Muses are in the two examples discussed in this chapter.[58] If epinician really *needed* to "arrogate to itself the traditional epichoric prestige and standing of the female chorus" in order to render the victor socially acceptable, then we might expect many more examples of such embedded songs within the corpus.[59]

Furthermore, Power's reluctance to allow the female voice in the poem to represent the poet fails to take account of the inherently self-referential quality of embedded song, seen here in the many links between the song of the maidens and the frame narrative. The girls sing as a voice from and on behalf of Aegina, and their song cannot be reduced to a mere mating cry. Their marriageability is certainly an aspect of their presence in the poem, but this need not rob their song of other types of significance.

In B. 13 Bacchylides presents us with a city filled with songs celebrating Pytheas and the glory of Aegina. The girls are not the only singing characters in the ode: as well as the revels mentioned at 73–74, the poet-narrator also exhorts

55 Kurke (1991) 257.

56 On commemoration in Pindar, see inter alios Carey (1981) 69–86; Agócs (2009) 33–92; Faraone (2002) 259–270; Segal (1985) 199–212; Thomas (2007) 141–166.

57 This argument applies mainly to 'informal' reperformance scenarios, where the song would not become a cult act on the part of the polis in which it was performed—see Currie (2004) 49–69.

58 Power (2000) 68–69.

59 Power (2000) 71–72. Of course, it may well be argued that this is an argument from silence. Nonetheless, it is striking that with so many epinicians preserved we have so few examples of embedded song.

a group of young men to sing at 190. This transference of song from the bardic 'I' βοάσω at 103 to a chorus emphasizes the choral performance context of the ode and creates an amoebaean effect, with the embedded chorus of girls singing the historic narrative and the boys the victor's present. At the end of the ode when the first-person narrator re-asserts his voice and presents the ode as a newly-woven gift of songs in the plural (ὕμνων τινὰ τάνδε ν[εόπλοκον δόσιν 223) he signals his creation of a plurality of verse within one poem.

Conclusion

The epinician poets' use of embedded song directly reflects their poetics, which have been shown to be both self-conscious and sophisticated in their awareness of the place of their poetry both in society and in the literary tradition. The comparison between the embedded songs in the lyric poems and their epic ancestors places the epinician examples in a wider poetic context and raises important objections to previous interpretations.

As Pindar hitches his ode to immortality by giving it voice through the Muses, so Bacchylides has his inset chorus sing of the Trojan War, claiming poetic immortality for himself by vying with Homer, and heroic immortality for his victor who is assimilated to the greatest of all Aeacids. Rather than adopting solely social or ritual functions to explain itself, B. 13 self-positions within the poetic tradition, appropriating epic motifs and re-presenting the Trojan War for an epinician context. This is not entirely to deny a social or communitarian role to the maiden-chorus. On the contrary, their identity as a specifically Aeginetan maiden chorus is crucial, for it is this which will have panhellenic appeal: Bacchylides is exporting an Aeginetan song for an Aeginetan victor, and the success of his strategy depends on encoding an image of the Aeginetan performance within the ode itself, a performance which could be re-created across the Greek world, but remain Aeginetan in flavor and bring fame upon the city and the victor.

Pindar interacts with the poetic tradition in a slightly different way: his ode is highly self-conscious of the varying credibility of different speakers and displays mythic innovation validated both as truth and as an appropriate subject for victory song by its origin in the mouths of the Muses. This consciousness of the difference between immortal and mortal speakers is bound up with a strategy of praise also seen in B. 13. The use of internal narrators has an immediate and obvious effect on the value of the praise given, in that it distances the poet (known to be commissioned and therefore biased) from the praise spoken in the poem and widens the scope of the victor's excellence. So, the appearance

of the Muses in *N.* 5 elevates the fame of victor to the heavens and makes him an object of interest for the gods, while it also presents the poet as an equivalent to the divine source of poetry. In B. 13, the Aeginetan chorus and indeed the *neoi* mentioned at the end of the poem create the illusion that Pytheas is hymned by his whole city: the technique places the victor in the context of his hometown and reflects his reception there.

These embedded songs thus widen the scope of the poems in several ways. The poets are able to show their virtuosity and define their place in the tradition, as well as place the subject of their song—the athletes—in a heroic context. There seems to be a reciprocal relationship between poet and athlete created through this association with heroes from poetry of the past: if Pytheas is an Achilles, Bacchylides is a Homer. In these odes, Pindar and Bacchylides show their sophisticated interest in the potential of their own art form, and the possibility of future reperformance of their songs across the Greek world. The use of embedded song shows their awareness of the various 'values' of different genres of poetry, the ability to adapt the motifs and techniques of another genre to their own, and the power of song to immortalize both victor and poet.

Bibliography

Agócs, P. 2009. "Memory and Forgetting in Pindar's *Seventh Isthmian*." In *Strategies of Remembrance from Pindar to Hölderlin*, ed. L. Dolezalová, 33–92. Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Alden, M.J. 1997. "The Resonances of the Song of Ares and Aphrodite." *Mnemosyne* 50: 513–529.

Bundy. E. 1986. *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley.

Burkert, W. 1960. "Das Lied vom Ares und Aphrodite." *RMP* 103: 130–144.

Burnett, A.P. 2005. *Pindar's Songs for the Young Athletes of Aegina*. Oxford.

Bury, J.B. 1890. *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*. London.

Buss, H. 1913. *De Bacchylide Homeri imitatore*. Diss. Giessen.

Cairns, D.L. 2010. *Bacchylides: Five Epinician Odes: 3, 5, 9, 11, 13*. Cambridge.

Carey, C. 1981. *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*. New York.

Carey, C. 1995. "Pindar and the Victory Ode." In *The Passionate Intellect*, ed. L. Ayres, 85–103. New Brunswick.

Carey, C.1999. "Ethos and Pathos in Bakchylides." In *One hundred years of Bacchylides*, ed. I.L. Pfeijffer and S.L. Slings, 17–29. Amsterdam.

Carne-Ross, D.S. 1985. *Pindar*. New Haven.

Currie, B.G.F. 2004. "Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes." In *Oral Performance and its Context*, ed. C.J. Mackie, 49–69. Leiden.

Drachmann, A.B. 1903–1927. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, 3 Volumes. Leipzig.
Faraone, C. 2002. “A Drink from the Daughters of Mnemosyne: Poetry, Eschatology and Memory at the end of Pindar’s Isthmian 6.” In *Vertis in Usum: Studies in honor of Edward Courtney*, ed. J.F. Miller, C. Damon, and K.S. Myers, 259–270. Leipzig.
Farnell, L.R. 1930. *The Works of Pindar translated, with Literary and Critical Commentaries. Volume 1: Translation in rhythmical prose with literary comments*. London.
Farnell, L.R. 1932. *The Works of Pindar translated, with Literary and Critical Commentaries. Volume 2: critical commentary*. London.
Fearn, D. 2007. *Bacchylides*. Oxford.
Fennell, C.A.M. 1893. *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. Cambridge.
Fennell, C.A.M. 1899. *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes*. Cambridge.
Fera, M.C. 2000. “Il canto delle Muse e il canto del poeta.” In *Poesia e religione in Grecia: studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera*, ed. R.M.C. Fera and S. Grandolini, 141–147. Perugia.
Finley, J. 1955. *Pindar and Aeschylus*. Cambridge, MA.
Fogelmark, S. 1979. “καὶ κείνοις: Pindar, *Nemean* 5.22.” In *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard W.M. Knox on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. G.W. Bowerstock, W. Burkert, and M.C. Putnam, 71–80. Berlin.
Gärtner, H.A. 1978. “Die Siegeslieder Pindars für die Söhne des Lampon.” *WJA* 4: 27–46.
Gianotti, G.F. 1975. *Per una poetica Pindarica*. Turin.
Harden, S.J. Forthcoming. *Embedded Song and the Performance of Poetry in Greek Literature*. Oxford.
Harden, S.J., and A. Kelly. 2013. “Proemic Convention and Character Construction in Early Greek Epic.” *HSCP* 107: 1–34.
Henry, W.B. 2005. *Pindar’s Nemeans: A Selection*. Leipzig.
Hubbard, T.K. 1985. *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry*. Leiden.
Hunter, R. 2008. “The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*.” In *Brill’s Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*, ed. T.D. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos, 115–146. Leiden.
Hutchinson, G.O. 2001. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*. Oxford.
Jebb, R.C. 1905. *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments*. Cambridge.
de Jong, I.J.F. 1985. “*Iliad* 1.366–392: A Mirror Story.” *Arethusa* 18: 5–22.
de Jong, I.J.F. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam.
de Jong, I.J.F. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge.
de Jong, I.J.F. 2004. “Homer.” In de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie, eds. (2004): 13–24.
de Jong, I.J.F., R. Nünlist, and A. Bowie, eds. 2004. *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative. Volume One*. Leiden.
Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca.

Lanata, G. 1963. *Poetica Pre-Platonica*. Florence.

Lefkowitz, M.R. 1991. *First Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic 'I'*. Oxford.

Lesky, A. 1937. "Motifkontamination." *WS* 55: 21–31.

Maehler, H. 1982. *Die Lieder des Bakchylides Vol. 1 Die Siegeslieder*. Leiden.

Maehler, H. 2004. *Bacchylides: A selection*. Cambridge.

Morrison, A.D. 2007. *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.

Nagy, G. 1990. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca.

Newton, R.M. 1987. "Odysseus and Hephaestus in the *Odyssey*." *CJ* 83: 12–20.

Nünlist, R. 2004. "The Homeric Hymns." In De Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie, eds (2004): 35–42.

Olson, S.D. 1989. "*Odyssey* 8: Guile, Force, and the Subversive Poetics of Desire." *Arethusa* 22: 135–145.

Pfeijffer, I.L. 1999. *Three Aigenetan Odes of Pindar: A commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III, and Pythian VIII*. Leiden.

Pfeijffer, I.L. 1995. "The Date of Pindar's fifth Nemean and Bacchylides' thirteenth ode." *CQ* 45: 318–332.

Pfeijffer, I.L. 2004. "Pindar and Bacchylides." In De Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie, eds. (2004): 213–232.

Power, T. 2000. "The Parthenoi of Bacchylides 13." *HSCPh* 100: 67–81.

Richardson, S. 1990. *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville.

Robbins, E.I. 1987. "Nereids with Golden Distaffs: Pindar, *Nem*. 5." *QUCC* 25: 25–33.

Scodel, R. 2001. "Poetic Authority and Oral Tradition in Hesiod and Pindar." In *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*, ed. J. Watson, 109–137. Leiden.

Segal, C. 1985. "Messages to the Underworld: an aspect of poetic immortalization in Pindar." *AJPh* 106: 199–212.

Segal, C. 1998. *Aglaia: The poetry of Alcman, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides, and Corinna*. Lanham.

Snell, B., and H. Maehler. 1992. *Bacchylides carmina cum fragmentis*. Leipzig.

Stern, J. 1971. "The Structure of Pindar's *Nemean* 5." *CPh* 66: 169–173.

Stoddard, K. 2004. *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod*. Leiden.

Stoneman, R. 1981. "Pindar and the Mythological Tradition." *Philologus* 125: 44–63.

Swift, L.A. 2010. *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*. Oxford.

Thomas, O. 2014. "Phemius Suite." *JHS* 134: 89–102.

Thomas, R. 2007. "Fame, Memorial and Choral Poetry: The Origins of Epinician—an Historical Study." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals*, ed. S. Hornblower and K. Morgan, 141–166. Oxford.

CHAPTER 8

Narratorial Authority and Its Subversion in Archilochus

Laura Swift

From the earliest examples of Greek poetry, we find poets developing strategies to bolster their authority and present their narrative as superior to that of their rivals. Thus, for example, poets include appeals to the Muses or stories of divine inspiration in order to provide external authority for the events they describe. Conversely, they use traditional moralizing to derive their own authority from the received wisdom of the community, or rhetorical techniques to make their words seem persuasive. This chapter will explore how such techniques are manipulated or parodied in the poetry of Archilochus, and I will argue that the self-conscious distortion of these traditional strategies is a characteristic feature of Archilochus' style. Archilochus' poetry is frequently humorous and acerbic, and it is therefore not surprising to find that the poet distorts the strategies used in "higher" poetic forms to draw attention to the vulgarity of his own narrative. The first part of the chapter will discuss two poems in which authoritative strategies are debunked for comic effect: frr. 25 and 122 W. Yet poems which are serious in tone may also manipulate such conventional strategies to confound audience expectations, and the second part of this chapter will show how this is achieved in the recently discovered "Telephus poem" (P. Oxy. LXIX 4708).[1] The chapter will focus in particular on the use of *gnōmai*, *exempla*, priamels, and mythological paradigms. As we shall see, the poet not only demonstrates his familiarity with these as authoritative devices but engages in detail with how they are conventionally deployed in poetry. By altering or subverting these expectations, Archilochus draws his audience's attention to his status as narrator and encourages them to reflect upon the poet's authority and question the validity of the statements they hear.

1 The text given for frr. 25 and 122 W is that printed in West's *IEG*^{2}; the text of P. Oxy. LXIX 4708 given is that of Obbink (2006), which supersedes his original publication of the fragment in Obbink (2005). Translations are my own.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_010

Fr. 25: Poetic Authority and the Wise Narrator

A common way to gain authority for a narrative is by making a gnomic statement that the audience will recognize from their cultural experience and agree to be true. When a poet offers a *gnōmē* directly to his audience, he presents himself as speaking not merely from subjective experience, but as the guardian of values passed down over generations.[2] Using a *gnōmē* is a way of enhancing one's own authority by appealing to a higher source of wisdom and insinuating that one has the right to disseminate these views on behalf of a wider community. In fr. 25 we see Archilochus alluding to the cultural authority conferred by *gnōmai* in a narrative whose moral is far from serious:[3]

⊗ [ ]τις ἀνθρώπου φυή,
ἀλλ’ ἄλλος ἄλλωι κα⌋ρδίην ἰαίν⌊ε⌋τα⌊ι.
].τ[.].μελησα[...]. σάθη
]ε βουκόλωι Φαλ[...]ιͅωι.
τοῦτ’ οὔτις ἄλλ]ος μάντις ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ εἶπέ σοι̣·
]γάρ μοι Ζεὺς πατὴρ Ὀλυμπίων
ἔ]θηκε κἀγαθὸν μετ’ ἀνδράσι
οὐ]δ’ ἂν Εὐρύμας διαψ̣έγο̣[ι

... human nature, but different people's hearts are gladdened by different things ... for Melesandros cock ... (cunt?) for the cowherd Phalan(gios). (It was no other) prophet but I who proclaimed this to you. For to me Zeus, the father of the Olympians made ... and good among men, and not even Eurymas would find fault.

What survives appears to be a proem that prepares the ground for a longer narrative illustrating the variability of human life, presumably to humorous effect.[4] The *gnōmē* with which the poem begins—humans are different—would have

2 For discussion of use of *gnōmai* within literary texts and how these affect the relationship between poet and audience, see Abrahams and Babcock (1977).

3 *Gnōmai* can be offered more or less directly; simply offering a *gnōmē* which applies directly to the addressee acts as marker of social authority; less confident speakers are more likely to present a *gnōmē* indirectly. For detailed discussion, see Lardinois (1997) 221–233 and Lardinois (2000).

4 For the original publication of this papyrus see Lobel (1954a), and for textual and papyrological discussion see Peek (1955); Latte (1955); Lasserre (1956); Mette (1960); Steffen (1961); Gallavotti (1975).

been a poetic commonplace even by the mid-seventh century BC; its tried-and-tested nature is evident from its rather tired expression in the Theognidea (900–901). The opening stanza of Sappho fr. 16 V is an imaginative play on the same idea, which shows another archaic poet attempting to revitalize a familiar motif by handling it in a novel fashion.[5] Indeed, the later history of Archilochus' text confirms that the moral in line 2 was traditional, for we find the line quoted by several sources as an illustrative example of this *gnōmē*.[6] The poem relies on this conventionality in order to generate humor, for it lulls the audience into a false sense of reassurance, creating the sense that this is a poem that will rehash familiar ground. Archilochus does compose serious and moralizing poems as well as vulgar ones (for example, frr. 13, 105, or 128 W), and so as the poem begins, the audience may be expecting something similar to these philosophical musings on the human condition. Part of the humor, therefore, lies in Archilochus' stylistic range, which means that the audience cannot anticipate what type of persona they will get.

This impression is then punctured with the crude language of the following lines, and the audience realizes that Archilochus is poking fun at the pompous persona he adopted at the opening. He follows the traditional strategy of moving from a general *gnōmē* to examples which support it, but rather than drawing on grand *exempla* from the world of myth, the poet instead refers to the differing sexual predilections of the lower classes.[7] The letter combination μεληςα in line 3 is almost certainly a name which balances the cowherd's name in line 4: Peek's suggestion (followed by West) of Μελησάνδρος increases the sexual humor, for the name (derived from μέλω + ἀνήρ) can be linked to its owner's fondness for the penis; similarly, the cowherd's name appears to evoke φαλλός, which indicates his own sexual preference (presumably heterosexuality).[8] Thus not only does Archilochus choose everyday low characters rather than gods or heroes to support his point, but the vulgar sense in which they illustrate the *gnōmē* is embedded in their names.

The language of the lines also enhances the sense of bathos: the poem begins in sweeping terms, speaking of ἀνθρώπου φυή (1), while the repetition in ἀλλ' ἄλλος ἄλλωι has a proverbial ring to it.[9] This use of two parts of ἄλλος to express variability can be traced back to Homer (ἄλλος γάρ τ' ἄλλοισιν ἀνὴρ ἐπιτέρπεται

5 Cf. Wills (1967); Stern (1970) 349–354; Hutchinson (2001) 161.

6 Schol. Hom. *Od.* 14.228; Sext. Emp. *adv. math.* 11.44; Clem. *Strom.* 6.7.3–5.

7 For the importance of humor and personal attack in the poem, cf. Gallavotti (1975) 153–162.

8 Cf. Bartol (1990) 85.

9 For the phonetics of Greek *gnōmai*, see Russo (1983) and Lardinois (2001), both of whom note assonance as a feature of proverbial expressions.

ἔργοις, *Od.* 14.228) and is found elsewhere in archaic poetry (e.g. Solon fr. 13.43). The metaphor of the heart melting in καρδίην ἰαίνεται is a common poetic way of expressing pleasure, and its variant (using θυμός) is a Homeric formula.[10] The language of the first two lines is therefore as conventional as the moral it conveys. However, when the *gnōmē* is undermined by its *exempla*, the linguistic register too shifts: σάθη is crude slang, a favorite term of Archilochus in his obscene fragments, and its presence here undermines the earlier high-flown language.[11] This humor contains an implicit challenge to the narrator's own authority; the sudden shift in register undermines the earlier moralizing and presents it as absurd, as the philosophical ideas turn out to be dependent on vulgar details.

Thus in the opening *gnōmē* Archilochus alludes to the stock image of the poetic narrator and his self-appointed role in expressing wisdom, only to immediately puncture this image. The play on the nature of the poetic persona continues in the following lines, as the poet explicitly raises the issue of his own authority. If a *gnōmē* contains an implicit claim to a higher authority (the shared beliefs of the community), an appeal to the divine acts as a more literal way of achieving a similar goal, for by presenting himself as divinely inspired, a poet claims access to the omniscience of the gods and so guarantees the reliability of his narrative.[12] Yet whereas a poet might conventionally describe himself as inspired by the Muses, Archilochus here goes further, presenting himself as a prophet with direct access to the will of the gods (μάντις, 5), and perhaps even aided by Zeus himself (μοι Ζεὺς … ἔ]θηκε, 6–7).[13]

10 Cf. *Il.* 23.598, 24.176; *Od.* 4.458–459, 6.155–156, and for examples using καρδία cf. Alcman fr. 59a *PMGF*; Pind. *Pyth.* 1.11.

11 σάθη is used by Archilochus at frr 43.1, 82.4, and also found at Ar. *Lys.* 1119; on its register see Scherer (1964) 103; Henderson (1975) 110; Rankin (1977b) 61.

12 For the use of divine invocations in guaranteeing authority, see Ford (1992) 57–79; Scodel (2001).

13 The interpretation of lines 6–7 is difficult because the object of ἔ]θηκε is missing, and scholars have disputed what the gift of Zeus is, and therefore how it should be connected to line 5. West (1974) 122 sees a break here, with line 6 as the start of a biographical story which forms a further illustration of the opening *gnōmē*: he argues that the missing word specified a personal relationship (his suggestions are προπάτορα or τὸν πατέρα) and suggests that the narrative told the story of Archilochus' father's relationship with a slave-girl called Enipo (Blame). However, there is nothing in the text that requires this: the poet could just as plausibly be saying (for example) that Zeus has given him a particularly good example to illustrate his point or that Zeus has given him the gift of poetry (or slander) to be able to explain this, and in this case Zeus' presence line 6 would be more closely connected with μάντις in 5. For this reading, cf. Steffen (1961); Burnett (1983) 66.

The appeal to the gods is therefore absurdly overblown and acts as a parody of other types of appeal to divine support. Moreover, the involvement of the gods in the narrative comes at a point where the speaker's authority has already been compromised, since the audience knows that divine omniscience is invoked not to tell the deeds of the great heroes of old, but to confirm the speaker's knowledge of other people's sex lives. Divine prophecy and Zeus' power is juxtaposed with the sexual peccadillos of a cowherd and the poet's prurient interest in detailing these sexual preferences. As with the opening *gnōmē*, Archilochus invokes a typical strategy only to derail it with a contrast in register which renders the poet's authority absurd. The poet proclaims his own wisdom in a way designed to undermine his position, and does so by subverting the typical strategies by which a poet can gain his audience's confidence.

Fr. 122 W: Authority and Embedded Narrative

If fr. 25 demonstrates Archilochus undercutting his own authority as poetic narrator, fr. 122 shows him using a similar set of techniques to parody the rhetorical tropes used by characters to present themselves as authoritative speakers, for here we find a third person within an Archilochean narrative using such language to achieve a shocking outcome.

⊗ "χρημάτων ἄελπτον οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐδ' ἀπώμοτον
οὐδὲ θαυμάσιον, ἐπειδὴ Ζεὺς πατὴρ 'Ολυμπίων
ἐκ μεσαμβρίης ἔθηκε νύκτ', ἀποκρύψας φάος
ἡλίου †λάμποντος, λυγρὸν† δ' ἦλθ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους δέος.
ἐκ δὲ τοῦ καὶ πιστὰ πάντα κἀπίελπτα γίνεται
ἀνδράσιν· μηδεὶς ἔθ' ὑμέων εἰσορέων θαυμαζέτω
μηδ' ἐὰν δελφῖσι θῆρες ἀνταμείψωνται νομὸν
ἐνάλιον, καί σφιν θαλάσσης ἠχέεντα κύματα
φίλτερ' ἠπείρου γένηται, τοῖσι δ' ὑλέειν ὄρος.
[Ἀρ]χηνακτίδης
[ ]ήτου πάϊς [
[ ]τύθη γάμωι̣[
[ ]. .α̣ι̣νε. .[
[ ]νεῖν·
[ ]
[ἀν]δράσιν·
[ ].[ ].[ ]

> There is nothing in the world which is unexpected, or that you could swear is impossible, or worthy of wonder, since Zeus father of the Olympians has turned midday to night and hidden away the light of the shining sun, and clammy fear came over mankind. Now everything may be believed and expected among men: let no one among you be surprised at what he sees, not even if the beasts of the land switch to the seaborne lifestyle of the dolphins and the echoing waves of the sea become dearer to them than the land, while the dolphins prefer the mountains … Archenactides … child of … in marriage … men.

The first nine lines of the poem are preserved by Stobaeus as an illustrative piece of moralizing on the theme of expectation (4.46.10) and are as conventional as the opening two lines of fr. 25.[14] However, we know from Aristotle's comments on the poem (*Rhet.*3.17.1418b28) that all is not what it seems, for he not only tells us that the lines were put into the mouth of a father speaking about his daughter, but also speculates that Archilochus puts the lines into the mouth of a third party to avoid being accused of abusive or vulgar behavior (ἔχει … ἢ λοιδορίαν ἢ ἀγροικίαν). Whether or not we agree with Aristotle's analysis, his comments indicate that the content of the poem must have been crude or shocking, and this is supported by his description of the fragment as blame poetry (ὡς Ἀρχίλοχος ψέγει).[15] The survival of lines 10–15 on a papyrus from the Oxyrhynchus collection give us clues as to what the invective content may have been, as marriage appears to be under discussion (γάμωι̣, 12) as well as a male patronymic name (Ἀρ]χηνακτίδης, 10).[16] The most likely scenario, then, and that accepted by most scholars, is that the father presents the prospect of his daughter's marriage as the most improbable natural event of all. As in fr. 25, the conventionality of the opening lines is essential to the poem's humor; the father's speech makes systematic use of the traditional devices by which a speaker gains authority for his argument, and this acts as a way to characterize both father and daughter, as well as to generate abuse.

---

14 For an overview of the textual issues in the version transmitted by Stobaeus, see Kamerbeek (1961) 6–7; Marcovich (1978); Gärtner (2008) 7–8. Much of the existing scholarship on the poem has discussed it with primary reference to the dating of Archilochus' life and debated which historical eclipse this could refer to: see, e.g., Blakeway (1936); Jacoby (1941); Lasserre and Bonnard (1958) xxiv–xxvi; Rankin (1977a).

15 On the use of speaking personae and masks, see Calame (1995) 46–52; Lavigne (2008) 99–102.

16 For the original publication, see Lobel (1954b); Peek (1956) 1–2.

Like fr. 25, the poem begins with a gnomic statement followed by examples to illustrate it, in this case, the claim that nothing is impossible for the gods. This is a staple of Greek thought, as demonstrated by its common use as an ending tag for Greek tragedies, and is not only conventional but pious.[17] The power of the gods is combined with another familiar motif: that of the *adúnaton*.[18] This *topos* is pervasive in Greco-Roman literature and compares an unexpected outcome to a fundamental overturning of the laws of nature, whether in broad patterns such as cosmology or the cycle of seasons, or at the more detailed level such as the habits of plants and animals.[19] In this instance, the speaker appears to be awestruck by the recent eclipse, and this experience leads him to philosophize more generally on the unpredictability of the world.[20] Archilochus' choice of the turning of day into night and the reversal of sea and land creatures is a typical way to express these ideas. Like fr. 25, the poem begins with what appears to be a well worn and familiar piece of folk wisdom. As in the previous poem, this effect is used to generate humor when the moral turns out to have an unexpected twist: the examples of nature overturned are revealed to be as nothing compared to the grossest breach of the natural order, a man who is prepared to marry the speaker's daughter. Hence the eclipse turns out not to symbolize man's wonder at what he cannot comprehend, but to act as an analogue for the speaker's own family affairs. This perversion of nature in the *gnōmē* takes on additional irony given its ultimate example is marriage: an institution which normally symbolizes harmony between humans and nature, through imagery of shared fertility and natural beauty. Moreover, the structure of the examples, which begin with the grand cosmological level and move down to forest creatures and dolphins, places the daughter at the lowest end of the scale, since it implies that she is lowlier even than the wild beasts and just as monstrous in appearance.[21]

---

17 Cf. the final lines of Eur. *Alc.*, *Andr.*, *Bacch.*, *Hel.*, *Med.*

18 Hessler (2008) suggests that the use of the *adúnaton* here influenced later treatments, but given the parallels he cites are generic rather than specific verbal echoes it seems more likely that Archilochus and later examples are both drawing on conventional tropes of what was already by the seventh century a well known motif.

19 For close analogies to the use here, cf. Eur. *Med.* 410–411, *Suppl.* 520–521; Theocr. 1.132–136. The *adúnaton* motif dates back early and its influence can be seen in Achilles' statement to Hector that they can no more make a pact than can lions and men or wolves and lambs (*Il.* 22.262–264) or his claim that he would not accept Agamemnon's gifts even if they were offered in impossible numbers (*Il.* 9.379–387). For an overview of the motif in Greek and Roman literature, see Canter (1930).

20 For the role of the eclipse in poetic terms, see Schmitz (2000).

21 See Burnett (1983) 68.

As well as parodying the *anélpton* motif, the poem plays on the conventions of the priamel and its use as a rhetorical device.[22] The priamel acts as a mechanism by which a speaker can gain authority for his viewpoint, since its purpose is to give an opinion in a way which lends it additional weight. In a priamel, the object or feature that the narrator chooses to prioritize is contrasted with potential rivals, but the structure of the priamel is designed to emphasize whatever the speaker has selected.[23] In fr. 122, Archilochus uses a conventional priamel technique: he begins with a summary statement which offers an overview of the topic at hand (χρημάτων ἄελπτον οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐδ' ἀπώμοτον | οὐδὲ θαυμάσιον, 1–2) and then supports the statement with examples, building up towards the most important of all. This technique can be traced back to Homer, where it is also used by speakers who wish to manipulate their audience's perspective on a situation. Thus, for example, Calypso uses the technique to complain that Odysseus' imminent departure is the ultimate embodiment of the principle that the gods are jealous and harsh (*Od.* 5.118–129). She begins with the summary statement (σχέτλιοί ἐστε, θεοί, 5.118), goes on to give the examples of the failed relationships of Dawn and Orion and Demeter and Iasion, before culminating with her own situation (ὣς δ' αὖ νῦν μοι ἄγασθε, θεοί, βροτὸν ἄνδρα παρεῖναι, "so now do you gods resent me for being with a mortal man"). Similarly, when Dione comforts Aphrodite she sets up her daughter's pain as the embodiment of the principle that the gods must sometimes suffer at mortal hands (πολλοὶ γὰρ δὴ τλῆμεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες | ἐξ ἀνδρῶν χαλέπ' ἄλγε' ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι τιθέντες, *Il.* 5.383–384) and gives three examples of gods being damaged before turning to Aphrodite's recent wounding at the hands of Diomedes (5.385–407).

These examples illustrate the role that the combination of *gnōmē* and priamel plays in bolstering authority for a particular narratological viewpoint, for both Homeric speakers use it to present the events they describe in a particular light, and one which is not objective or in line with the audience's perspective. In the first case, the audience knows that the envy of male gods is not what is at stake here: rather, Calypso has to give up Odysseus because Zeus has been persuaded by Athena's fondness for the hero. Within the broader story of Odysseus' *nostos*, the audience is unlikely to be convinced that the most important feature of this scene is Calypso's frustration at divine double-standards. Far from being killed by jealous gods, Odysseus is being liberated from a relationship he does not want, and Calypso's attempt to assimilate him to the victims of divine

22 For the combination of priamel structure with *adúnaton*, see Race (1982) 28–29.

23 See Race (1982) 18–20; Kirby (1984).

cruelty reflects her own agenda. Similarly, the audience can see that Dione is attempting to comfort Aphrodite by presenting her wound at the end of a list of examples of divine suffering. Since we know that she has only incurred a minor scratch, we can see the humor inherent in her mother's attempt to aggrandize it, and Aphrodite can be flattered by the idea that her suffering can be taken seriously, but consoled by the reminder that far worse things have happened to others.

Archilochus uses the same technique to characterize the father and daughter to humorous effect and to highlight the father's complete disdain for his child.[24] Far from attempting to find a suitable match for his daughter, he instead goes out of his way to present her as undesirable and to present her marriage as a perversion of the natural order. The humor here is enhanced by the poet's use of the conventions relating to *gnōmai* and speakers in Greek culture, for, as Lardinois notes in his study of Homeric *gnōmai*, this kind of indirect *gnōmē* which sheds light on a third party who is not the theoretical addressee is often used to cast blame: hence the father's use of a gnomic statement which turns out to reflect on his daughter rather than the audience is a sly way of further discrediting her.[25] The father suggests that his moralizing is inspired by the eclipse, a phenomenon he presents as the direct intervention of Zeus (2–3). The implication is that he sees the eclipse as a divine portent sent to warn us of the unnatural nature of the marriage, a claim which not only indicates his daughter's unique hideousness, but also characterizes the father as self-important to the point of solipsism. Thus the techniques that usually help a speaker present himself as plausible are in fact used to make him, as well as his daughter, the butt of the humor. As in fr. 25, Archilochus turns these techniques against those who try to use them: far from generating authority, they turn out to undermine it.

An Ambiguous Paradigm: The Telephus Elegy (P. Oxy. LXIX 4708)

Both fragments examined so far are examples of Archilochus manipulating the conventions of narrative authority in a fashion designed to generate humor. The final poem to be discussed demonstrates that Archilochus' subversion of conventional narrative techniques is not limited to parody, but can also create

24 As Lardinois (2000) notes, the ways in which speakers within a narrative make use of traditional rhetorical strategies (such as *gnōmai*) can be an effective way of characterizing them.

25 Cf. Lardinois (1997) 229.

more nuanced effects in poems with a serious tone. The newly discovered Telephus elegy showcases this to good effect, since it represents Archilochus dealing with a mythological paradigm in a way that many scholars have found surprising:[26]

] . . . . [
εἰ δὲ] . [. . . .] . [.] . . θεοῦ κρατερῆ[ς ὑπ’ ἀνάγκης
οὐ χρὴ] ἀ̣ν̣[α]λ̣[κείη]ν̣ κ̣αι κακότητα λέγει̣[ν·
π]ή̣μ̣[α]τ̣’ ε̣ὖ̣ [εἴμ]εθα δ̣[ῆι]α φυγεῖν· φεύγ[ειν δέ τις ὥρη·
κ̣α̣ί̣ π̣οτ̣[ε μ]οῦνο̣ς ἐ̣ὼ̣ν̣ Τήλεφος Ἀ̣ρκα̣[σίδης
Ἀργείων ἐφόβ̣ησε πολὺν στρατ̣[όν,] ο̣[ἱ δὲ φέβοντο
ἄ̣λκι̣μ̣[οι,] ἦ τ̣όσα δὴ μοῖρα θεῶν ἐ̣φόβε̣ι̣,
αἰχμητ̣α̣ί̣ περ̣ ἐόντε[ς.] ἐϋρρείτ̣ης δὲ Κ[άϊκος
π]ι̣π̣τ̣ό̣ν̣των νεκύων στείνετ̣ο καὶ [πεδίον
Μ̣ύσ̣ι̣ο̣ν̣, οἱ δ’ ἐπὶ θῖν̣α̣ πολυφλο̣ίσβοι[ο θαλάσσης
χέρσ’] ὑ̣π’ ἀμειλίκτου φωτὸς ἐναιρό[μενοι
προ]τ̣ροπάδην ἀπ̣ἐ̣κλινον ἐϋκν̣ήμ̣[ιδες Ἀχαιοί·
ἀ]σ̣πάσιοι δ’ ἐς νέας̣ ὠ[κ]υ̣π̣όρ[ο]υ̣ς̣ [ἐσέβαν
π̣αῖδές τ̣’ ἀ̣θανάτων κ̣α̣ὶ̣ ἀδελφεο̣ί̣, [οὓς Ἀγαμέμνων
Ἴ̣λιον εἰς ἱερὴν ἦγε μαχησομένο̣[υς·
ο]ἱ δὲ τότ̣ε̣ β̣λαφθέντες ὁδοῦ παρὰ θ[ῖν’ ἀφίκοντο·
Τε]ύθραντο̣ς δ̣’ ἐ̣ρ̣ατὴν πρ̣ὸς πόλιν [ἐ]ξ̣[έπεσον·
ἔ]ν̣θ̣α̣ [μ]ἐ̣ν̣ο̣ς πνείοντ̣ε̣ς̣ ὁμως αὐτ̣ο̣[ί τε καὶ ἵπποι
ἀ]φ̣ρ̣[αδί]ηι μεγάλως θυμὸν ἀκηχ̣έ̣[δατο·
φ]ά̣ντ̣ο̣ γὰρ ὑψίπ̣υλον Τρώων πόλιν̣ εἰσ[αναβαίνειν
αἶ]ψα· μ̣[ά]τ̣η̣ν̣ δ’ἐπάτεον Μυσίδα πυροφόρο̣[ν.
Ἡρακλ]έ̣η̣ς̣ δ̣’ ἤν̣τησ̣[ε] βοῶν̣ ταλ̣[α]κάρδιον [υἱόν,
οὖ]ρον ἀ̣μ̣[εί]λ̣ι̣κ̣[τον] δηΐωι ἐν [πολ]έ̣μ̣[ωι
Τ]ήλεφον ὃς̣ Δ̣α̣ν̣α̣οῖσι κακὴν̣ [τ]ό̣[τε φύζαν ἐνόρσας
ἤ]ρ̣ειδ̣ε [πρό]μαχος̣, πατρὶ χαριζό̣μ̣[ενος
. . .] . . . . [.] . . . . . [
. . .] . [.] . . . [. . . . . .] . . [
. . .] . . . . [. . . . . .] . θα . [

26 Various scholars have suggested alternative readings and supplements, some of which are arguably preferable to the text of Obbink. Since my argument relies on the poem's general narrative flow rather than depending on individual supplements, I print Obbink's text for the sake of simplicity, but for textual discussion and alternative readings, see West (2006); D'Alessio (2006); Henry (2006); Magnelli (2006); Bernsdorff (2006); Tammaro (2006); Nicolosi (2006); Luppe (2006); Nicolosi (2007).

> If (one retreats?) under the powerful compulsion of a god, one shouldn't call it weakness or cowardice; we were right when we hastened to flee our dreadful suffering: there is a proper time for flight. Even Telephus Arkasides once, alone as he was, put to flight the great army of the Argives, and those powerful men fled—so great was the fate of the gods that routed them—spearmen though they were. The Kaikos with its beautiful streams was crammed with the bodies as they fell, and so was the Mysian plain, but the well-greaved Achaeans, slain at the hands of a pitiless man, turned away headlong towards the shore of the much-resounding sea. Gladly did they embark on their swift ships, the sons and brothers of immortals, whom Agamemnon was leading to holy Ilios to fight. But at that time they had lost their way and come to that shore; they fell upon the lovely city of Teuthras, and there, in their folly, snorting battle-might along with their horses, they were despondent in their hearts. For they thought they were quickly going up against the high-gated city of the Trojans; in vain did they tread upon wheat-bearing Mysia. And Heracles came to meet them, shouting to his brave-hearted son, Telephus, a pitiless guardian in battle, who aroused cowardly flight in the Danaans and strove in the front ranks to please his father.

Although the opening of the fragment is badly damaged, enough remains to indicate that we have some kind of musing on the ethics of flight in battle (φυγεῖν· φεύγ[ειν, 4) when divine will is involved (θεοῦ κρατερῆ[ς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης, 2) and whether it should automatically be considered cowardice (ḳαι κακότητα λέγει̣[ν, 3). Most scholars agree that the myth of Telephus is used as a paradigm to shed light on this question; a shift from present to mythological time is suggested by ḳα̣ί̣ π̣οτ̣[ε in 5, while the juxtaposition of φυγεῖν and φεύγ[ειν with its change in aspect implies that a contrast is being drawn between a specific and a general point. Moreover, the first-person plural ending]εθα in 4 implies a separation between the "we" outside the myth and the third persons inside it.[27] Yet although scholars generally agree that we are dealing with a paradigm, there is wide debate about its nature and what lesson the poet intends it to teach.[28] In this discussion, scholars have overlooked how surprising it is that

27 Cf. Obbink (2006) 8; West (2006) 15; d'Alessio (2006) 21–22; Mayer (2006) 15–16; Aloni and Iannucci (2007) 208–209. For a counter-view, however, arguing that the myth is told for its own sake rather than paradeigmatically, see see Bowie (2010) 151.

28 Thus Obbink (2006) reads the poem as consolatory in function, whereas Mayer (2006) argues that the poem is critical of the Achaeans (and hence the audience); Barker and

Archilochus leaves it open to such ambiguity. For on analysis, the difficulties in pinning down the moral of the paradigm cannot simply be put down to the problematic state of the text: rather we see a deliberate attempt by the poet to keep the paradigm unsettling and to leave the audience in doubt as to how it should be interpreted.[29]

Once the poet has established a *gnōmē* that flight in battle should not be classed as cowardice if the gods are against you, we might expect it to be illustrated by an example of a brave man forced to flee in battle. Yet it is Telephus rather than the Achaeans who is introduced as the immediate subject of the paradigm (κ̣α̣ί̣ π̣οτ̣[ε μ]οῦνος̣ ἐ̣ὼ̣ν̣ Τήλεφος Ἀ̣ρκα̣[σίδης | Ἀργείων ἐφόβ̣ησε πολὺν στρατ̣[όν,]: Telephus as victor dominates our attention with μ]οῦνος̣ ἐ̣ὼ̣ν̣ thrown forward to open the paradigm; conversely the Achaeans only feature as the objects of his triumph. When focus shifts to the Achaeans themselves, it is marked by a change of subject (ο̣[ἱ δέ, 6). Thus the immediate focus on the paradigm is not the nobility of the defeated Achaeans and how they had little choice but to flee, but rather on the brilliance of Telephus, and so the desirability of routing one's enemy on the battlefield. From the audience's perspective this creates an unsettling effect, since the poet raises expectations that the paradigm will fit neatly with the opening *gnōmē*, only to present us with something rather more complicated.

Having confounded our initial expectations, Archilochus changes tack and seems to return to the original *gnōmē* by shifting focus from Telephus to the Achaeans, whose martial prowess is now described: they are brave (ἄ̣λκι̣μ̣[οι,], 7), good spearmen (αἰχμητ̣α̣ί̣ περ̣ ἐόντε[ς], 8) and have only fled because of divine decree (ἦ τ̣όσα δὴ μοῖρα θεῶν ἐ̣φόβ̣ε̣ι̣, 7). Yet just as the paradigm appears to be returning to its expected path, we are confronted with another image of the mighty Telephus which encourages us to focus on his heroic victory rather than the Achaeans' nobility in defeat (8–10). Here Telephus is not named, but the description of the river Kaikos and the plain of Mysia covered with bodies shifts the emphasis onto him and evokes Achilles' *aristeia* and his slaughter of the Trojans in the Xanthos.[30] The οἱ̣ δ' in 10 signals another shift back to the Achaeans, whose retreat is now described in more detail, culminating

Christensen (2006) read the poem as intentionally counter-cultural; and Aloni and Iannucci (2007) find the poem internally inconsistent. See also Nobili (2009) 231–232.

29 For further discussion of this point and how it affects the interpretation of the poem, see Swift (2012).

30 There is a close verbal parallel here, since the description in Archilochus νεκύων στείνετ̣ο (9) echoes the Homeric river's complaint at *Il.* 21.220 that he is στεινόμενος νεκύεσσι: the only time that the verb is used in Homer with this sense.

in a flashback to explain their reasons for being in Mysia and returning once more to their defeat at the hands of Telephus (13–21).

The poem (as we have it) concludes with still another shift, bringing the focus back on to Telephus victorious, with the image of him striving to please his father Heracles, who has favored him with a personal appearance. Again, we are back in the world of the Homeric *aristeia*, with a divinity coming down to the battlefield to support his chosen hero, and these techniques encourage us to see Telephus as the emotional focus of this section. Thus we see that Archilochus consistently "flips" perspective between the two possible subjects of the paradigm and by doing so keeps the audience uncertain what the purpose of the myth is. A focus on Telephus and his triumph implies that the paradigm dwells on the glory to be won in battle; if the "we" outside the paradigm are those who fled in battle, the paradigm becomes an implicit criticism, or at least an acknowledgement that flight is a problematic choice. Conversely, a focus on the Achaeans is much more straightforwardly consolatory, as it acts as a reminder that even great heroes sometimes need to flee.

Archilochus does not allow the paradigm to settle on one or the other and consistently switches between the two to keep the audience disorientated; this creates a sense of tension within the myth. By being kept uncertain as to which party we are meant to sympathize with, we are also led to question what the function of drawing on the world of myth is. Yet the poet's strategy relies on the audience having deep-seated assumptions about the purpose and role of a mythological paradigm should be: namely that it should map directly onto the world outside the myth and provide an elucidation of the contemporary situation.[31] By telling a paradigm in a way that manipulates these expectations, Archilochus encourages the audience to reflect more deeply on the morality of the opening *gnōmē* and to consider the degree to which myth can be used as a guide to our own experiences. If the contemporary situation involves a military defeat, it is tempting to see the ambiguous paradigm as reflecting a sense of confusion as to how to interpret the audience's own recent experiences; the paradigm suggests the anxiety inherent in defeat and juxtaposes this with the temptation to explain it away as unimportant. While the audience might like to believe that their defeat is as temporary a setback as the Achaeans' troubles in Mysia, the brilliance of Telephus acts as a warning and a reminder that retreat is never an uncomplicated option.

---

31 For the traditional uses of paradigms (particularly in Homer) with which Archilochus' audience would be familiar, see Willcock (1964); Austin (1966); Anderson (1987); Howie (1995).

Conclusion: Archilochus and Authority

The three fragments examined are testament to Archilochus' interest in strategies by which a speaker can generate authority for his narrative. It is characteristic of Archilochus' poetry to distort these techniques and present them in a way designed to unsettle or shock the audience. This approach fits more broadly with Archilochus' style and the ends to which his poetry is deployed, for Archilochus elsewhere shows an interest in deconstructing or reworking conventional poetic tropes: we might think, for example, of his conversion of the rural seduction scene in the First Cologne Epode into a forum for an attack on Neoboule (fr. 196a.24–31 W) or his use of nature imagery in the Second Cologne Epode (fr. 188 W) to abuse an old woman rather than to praise a young one. These examples draw on a familiar poetic conceit, the idea that the female body and the sex act can be described through the language of vegetal growth. In both cases, Archilochus evokes this traditional concept in order to derail it by using the imagery in a startling way and so causing the audience to reflect upon their own expectations.

As we have seen from the poems analyzed above, the poet applies a similar strategy to narrative techniques, creating a sense of familiarity which he then undermines. While these mechanisms usually encourage the audience to trust the speaker's authority, these devices invite them to pay closer consideration to the reliability of the narrator and his claim to an authoritative viewpoint. Fragment 25 parodies the idea of the poet inspired by divine and communal authority by reimagining this figure in the context of iambic narrative: unlike a Homer or Hesiod, with authority to tell of the deeds of gods and men, Archilochus uses his claims to wisdom for insights into the most vulgar aspects of human experience. In fr. 122 W we see a portrayal of a speaker who uses these strategies to his own ends, yet fails to realize that his narrative works to discredit him. In these fragments, the poet constructs personae who are incompetent in their use of narratological strategies, and the audience can feel amusement at their expense and feel satisfied by their superior ability to understand where the speaker has gone wrong. The Telephus elegy invites us to consider the purpose of a mythological paradigm by creating a gap between the myth and the *gnōmē* which it purports to illustrate. Although the three poems vary in tone and content, all of them demonstrate an interest in the nature of poetic authority and the techniques by which it is acquired.

This analysis not only casts light on what is characteristic about Archilochus' style, but also gives us crucial insight into audience expectations at this period, for the poems work only if the audience recognizes the tropes that are being manipulated and is in a position to compare them to poetic convention. More-

over, the poems imply a widespread interest in the role of the poet as authoritative narrator, since Archilochus selects this as a fertile area in which to play poetic games. Thus we can infer that a seventh-century Parian or Thasian audience were sufficiently steeped in poetic culture to appreciate the parody of the omniscient poet in fr. 25 or familiar enough with the concept of myth as paradigm to recognize why it is oddly applied in the Telephus elegy. By misapplying these poetic devices, Archilochus draws our attention to them and flatters his audience by treating them as aficionados in the tricks that other poets use. When an audience member recognizes the parody, therefore, he cannot only enjoy the humor it creates, but also take pleasure in his own insight into the world of the poet. Thus Archilochus foregrounds the relationship between poet and audience and invites the audience to see themselves as active participants in the discourse of how narrative authority is granted and retained.

Bibliography

Abrahams, R.D., and B.A. Babcock. 1977. "The literary use of proverbs." *Journal of American Folklore* 90: 414–429.

Aloni, A., and A. Iannucci. 2007. *L'elegia greca e l'epigramma dalle origini al V secolo. Con un' appendice sulla 'nuova' elegia di Archiloco*. Florence.

Anderson, Ø. 1987. "Myth, paradigm, and 'spatial form' in the *Iliad*." In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*, ed. J.M. Bremer, I.J.F. de Jong, and J. Kalff, 1–13. Amsterdam.

Austin, N. 1966. "The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*." *GRBS* 7: 295–312.

Barker, E.T.E., and J.P. Christensen 2006. "Flight Club: The New Archilochus Fragment and its Resonance with Homeric Epic." *MD* 57: 9–41.

Bartol, K. 1990. "Il frammento 25 W. (55 T.) di Archiloco." *AION* 12: 81–87.

Bernsdorff, H. 2006. "Halbgötter auf der Flucht—Zu P. Oxy. 4708 (Archilochos?)." *ZPE* 158: 1–7.

Blakeway, A. 1936. "The Date of Archilochus." In *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays presented to G. Murray on his Seventieth Birthday*, 33–56. Oxford.

Bowie, E. 2010. "Historical Narrative in Archaic and Early Classical Greek Elegy." In *Epic and history*, ed. D. Konstan and K.A. Raaflaub, 145–166. Malden.

Burnett, A.P. 1983. *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*. London.

Calame, C. 1995. *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece*. Tr. J. Orion. Ithaca.

Canter, H.V. 1930. "The figure adunaton in Greek and Latin poetry." *AJPh* 51: 32–41.

D'Alessio, G.B. 2006. "Note al nuovo Archiloco (POxy LXIX 4708)." *ZPE* 156: 19–22.

Ford, A. 1992. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca.

Gallavotti, C. 1975. "I giambi di P. Oxy. 2310 attribuiti ad Archiloco." *Philologus* 119: 153–162.

Gärtner, T. 2008. "Kritische Überlegungen zu den Fragmenten des Archilochos." *Hermes* 136: 1–14.

Henderson, J. 1975. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. New Haven.

Henry, W.B. 2006. "Archilochus, P. Oxy. 4708 fr. 1.18–21." *ZPE* 156: 14.

Hessler, J.E. 2008. "Eine Sonnenfinsternis und ihre Folgen." In *Die Dichter und die Sterne: Beiträge zur lateinischen und griechischen Literatur für Ludwig Braun*, ed. U. Schlegelmilch and T. Thanner, 1–12. Würzburg.

Howie, J.G. 1995. "The *Iliad* as Exemplum." In *Homer's World*, ed. Ø. Andersen and M. Dickie, 141–173. Bergen.

Hutchinson, G.O. 2001. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*. Oxford.

Jacoby, F. 1941. "The Date of Archilochus." *CQ* 35: 97–109.

Kamerbeek, J.C. 1961. "Archilochea." *Mnemosyne* 14: 1–15.

Kirby, J.T. 1984. "Towards a General Theory of the Priamel." *CJ* 80: 142–144.

Lardinois, A. 1997. "Modern Paroemiology and the Use of Gnomai in Homer's *Iliad*." *CP* 92: 213–234.

Lardinois, A. 2000. "Characterisation through Gnomai in Homer's *Iliad*." *Mnemosyne* 53: 641–661.

Lardinois, A. 2001. "The Wisdom and Wit of Many: The Orality of Greek Proverbial Expressions." In *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*, ed. J. Watson, 93–107. Leiden.

Lasserre, F. 1956. "Un nouveau poème d'Archiloque." *MH* 13: 226–235.

Lasserre, F., and A. Bonnard, ed. 1958. *Archiloque: Fragments*. Paris.

Latte, K. 1955. "Review of Oxyrhynchus papyri XXII, ed. Lobel and Roberts." *Gnomon* 77: 491–499.

Lavigne, D.E. 2008. "The Persona of Archilochus and Iambic Performance." In *Archilochus and his Age: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades*, ed. D. Katsonopoulou, I. Petropoulos, and S. Katsarou, 91–111. Athens.

Lobel, E. 1954a. "2310. Archilochus, Iambic Trimeters." *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 22: 3–11.

Lobel, E. 1954b. "2313. Archilochus, Trochaic Tetrameters." *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 22: 24–34.

Luppe, W. 2006. "Archilochus, fr. 23, 11–21." *APF* (*Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete*) 52: 131–132.

Magnelli, E. 2006. "On the New Fragments of Greek Poetry from Oxyrhynchus." *ZPE* 158: 9–12.

Marcovich, M. 1978. "Archilochus Fr. 122 West (ap. Stob. 4.46.10.)." *RhM* 121: 101–102.

Mayer, P. 2006. "Krieg aus Versehen? Zur Funktion und Aussage der Telephos-Geschichte im neuen Archilochos (P. Oxy. 4708, fr. 1)." *ZPE* 157: 15–18.

Mette, H.J. 1960. "Zu Archilochos Pap. Ox. 2310 fr. 1 col. 1." *Hermes* 88: 493–494.

Nicolosi, A. 2006. "Sul nuovo Archiloco elegiaco (*P. Oxy.* 4708 fr. 1)." *Eikasmos* 17: 25–31.

Nicolosi, A. 2007. *Ipponate, epodi di Strasburgo—Archiloco, epodi di Colonia* (*con un'appendice su P. Oxy.* LXIX *4708*). Eikasmos 14. Bologna.

Nobili, C. 2009. "Tra epos ed elegia: il nuovo Archiloco." *Maia* 61: 229–249.

Obbink, D. 2005. "4708. Archilochus, elegies (more of VI 854 and XXX 2507)." *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 69: 19–42.

Obbink, D. 2006. "A New Archilochus Poem." *ZPE* 156: 1–9.

Peek, W. 1955. "Die Archilochos-Gedichte von Oxyrhynchos." *Philologus* 99: 193–219.

Peek, W. 1956. "Die Archilochos-Gedichte von Oxyrhynchos, II." *Philologus* 100: 1–28.

Race, W.H. 1982. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*. Leiden.

Rankin, H.D. 1977a. "Archilochus' Chronology and some Possible Events of his Life." *Eos* 65: 5–15.

Rankin, H.D. 1977b. *Archilochus of Paros*. Park Ridge, NJ.

Russo, J. 1983. "The poetics of the Ancient Greek Proverb." *Journal of Folklore Research* 20: 121–130.

Scherer, A. 1964. "Die Sprache des Archilochos." In *Archiloque: sept exposés suivis de discussions*, ed. J. Pouilloux, N.M. Kontoleon, A. Scherer, et al., 89–116. Geneva.

Schmitz, T.A. 2000. "Delphine als Bergwanderer. Die Sonnenfinsternis bei Archilochos (frg. 122 W.)." In *"Stürmend auf finsterem Pfad …": ein Symposion zur Sonnenfinsternis in der Antike*, ed. H. Köhler, H. Görgemanns, and M. Baumbach, 125–149. Heidelberg.

Scodel, R. 2001. "Poetic Authority and Oral Tradition in Hesiod and Pindar." In *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman world*, ed. J. Watson, 109–138. Leiden.

Steffen, W. 1961. "Die neuen Iambengedichte des Archilochos. Zum Pap. Oxy. 2310, Fr. 1, Kol. 1." *Proceedings of the IXth International Congress of Papyrology*, 18–29. Oslo.

Stern, E.M. 1970. "Sappho fr. 16 L.P. Zur strukturellen Einheit ihrer Lyrik." *Mnemosyne* 23: 348–361.

Swift, L.A. 2012. "Archilochus the 'Anti-Hero'? Heroism, Flight and Values in Homer and the New Archilochus Fragment (P.Oxy. LXIX 4708)." *JHS* 132.

Tammaro, V. 2006. "Noterelle al nuovo Archiloco (*P. Oxy.* 4708)." *Eikasmos* 17: 33–35.

West, M.L. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin.

West, M.L. 2006. "Archilochus and Telephos." *ZPE* 156: 11–17.

Willcock, M.M. 1964. "Mythological paradeigma in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 14(2): 141–154.

Wills, G. 1967. "The Sapphic 'Umwertung aller Werte'." *AJPh* 88: 434–442.

CHAPTER 9

The Invention of Stesichorus: Hesiod, Helen, and the Muse*

Jesús Carruesco

Stesichorus was known in antiquity as ὁμηρικώτατος, and his close link with the Homeric tradition of heroic epic poetry is indeed an essential aspect of his work, as has been acknowledged in modern scholarship.[1] This judgment, however, should not lead us to underestimate his relation to Hesiod and the Hesiodic tradition. In a tradition known to Aristotle and Philochorus, Stesichorus was presented as Hesiod's son.[2] Furthermore, as far as we know the only poet explicitly mentioned in his work is Hesiod, if we are to believe the author of the hypothesis to the *Shield of Herakles*, which states that Stesichorus acknowledged Hesiod as the author of that poem.[3] The relationship with Hesiod, mainly to the proems of the *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, may prove a helpful point of departure for exploring some aspects of the definition of Stesichorus' persona as representative of a specific kind of poetry. In this paper, I will focus in particular on the relationship of the poet with Helen in the *Palinode*, where this self-definition was carried out.

* Particular thanks go to the editor and the organizing team of a highly stimulating conference. Thanks are also due to my colleagues in the research group "Representation of the past and dynamics of performance in ancient Greece" (FFI2015–68548-P MINECO/FEDER UE). Many thanks also to the anonymous reader for his/her helpful comments, which have significantly enriched both the form and the substance of this paper. However, any mistakes it may contain are exclusively my own.

1 The link between Stesichorus and Homer appears already in Simonides: Stesich. TA1a PMGF (= Simon. fr. 564). Cf. Kelly (2015).

2 TA 1–6 PMGF.

3 Fr. 269 (the numbering of Stesichorus' fragments used throughout is that of Davies' and Finglass' edition). Janko (1986) 41f., argues for the authenticity of the reference. In that case, Hesiod's name must necessarily have been mentioned by Stesichorus, whereas in fr. 90, which states that both Homer and Hesiod were criticized by Stesichorus, the allusion may well have been implicit in the refutation of the traditional stories about Helen, as in the preserved lines "you did not go on the well-benched ships and you did not reach the citadel of Troy." The explicit mention of the names of the epic poets seem to belong to the interpretation of those lines in Chamaeleon's commentary, as paraphrased by the author of the papyrus. A similar observation could be made for the reference to the obscure poet Xanthus mentioned in fr. 281.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_011

Let us begin with the name of Stesichorus. The phrase χορὸν ἱστάναι is frequently used to mean "setting up the chorus". As shown by Gregory Nagy,[4] this is a common marker of the function of the *chorēgos* (as is the analogous χοροστάτις in Alcman's *Partheneion*), and through the choral mechanism of ritual substitution or mimetic impersonation, it applies also to the composer as well as to the divine or mythic figure the *chorēgos* may stand for (Artemis, Aphrodite, or Helen, for instance). To the list of those who may be said to χορὸν ἱστάναι should be added the *choreutai*, as in many cases there are the dancers themselves who "set up or make up the chorus."[5]

These correspondences reveal the essentially mimetic nature of choral practice, as a series of interchangeable levels, which is taken up by the name of Stesichorus. This is also brought out by the two documents in which this word is attested as applied to entities other than the poet: the inscription on the François Vase, in which one of the Muses is called Stesichore and an early-5th century cup of Douris, with the expression στησίχορον ὕμνον ἄγοισαι ("introducing a *stēsikhoros* song").[6] Thus, independently of the precise relationship these two documents may have had with Stesichorus, they prove at the very least that the term can designate not just the poet but also the *chorēgos* and the *choreutai*, the Muse, and, most importantly, the song itself (perhaps to be understood as a choral *prooimion*, if we compare it with the Pindaric phrase ἀγησιχόρων προοιμίων).[7]

On the François Vase, the names and groupings of the Muses represented correspond to the Hesiodic text, down to the visual highlighting of Calliope's status as she opens the march, echoing in Hesiod her placement at the end of the catalogue, with a whole verse dedicated to her: Καλλιόπη θ'· ἣ δὲ προφερεστάτη ἐστὶν ἁπασέων (Hes. *Th.* 79). The only significant departure from the Hesiodic text is Stesichore, who has been substituted here for Hesiod's Terpsichore. The choice of the feminine form of Stesichorus' name in an otherwise purely Hesiodic list implies on the one hand an identification (or at least a close link) between the poet and the Muse, and on the other hand an affiliation to the Hesiodic tradition, whether this iconographic document reflects the Stesichorean innovation or, alternately, it attests to a previously existing variant within the Hesiodic tradition to which Stesichorus adhered.[8]

---

4 Nagy (1990) 361.

5 Pind. fr. 52b. 99; E. *El.* 178; Ar. *Nub.* 271; Paus. 3. 10. 7.

6 PMG 938[c]; cf. Sider (2010).

7 Pind. *Pyth.* 1.4.

8 Cf. Stewart (1983). Haslam (1991) argues against the direct influence of Stesichorus on the François vase, but this does not exclude other possible links, such as, e.g., a parallel allusion

The choice of this emphatically and explicitly choral name must be understood in relation to those of Homer and Hesiod, especially that of the latter. As Nagy has shown, the probable meanings of the names of the two archetypal epic poets were linked to the Muses and their song, and more specifically in a choral context.[9] As I have argued elsewhere, the epic poet needs to appropriate "chorality"—understood as a wide cultural model articulating the whole of Archaic Greek culture, and not only poetry—in order to obtain authority, both epichoric and panhellenic.[10] In this sense, the name Stesichorus aspires to the same aim, but within a specifically choral medium.[11] Hesiod's name, understood as "he who projects his voice," like the Muses' ὄσσαν ἱεῖσαι of *Th.* 10, emphasizes the voice conferred to him by the divine chorus, as he explicitly says in l. 31: ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδὴν. In contrast, in selecting the only name among the nine containing the term χορός,[12] Stesichorus relates himself, as we have seen, to the choral medium as a whole, and particularly to its power of mimesis, that is, the power of choral performance to connect, even identify the god, the hero, the composer, the song, the successive performers, and their audiences.[13] The

to the Hesiodic tradition, in which the variant Terpsichore / Stesichore (note the metrical equivalence) could well have existed before Stesichorus and the vase.

9 Nagy (1999) 296–297.

10 Carruesco (2010). Chorality is a potent conceptual tool that is fundamental in Greek culture for articulating reality at multiple levels, such as spatial (nodal points, such as the agora or the sanctuaries, as well as axial lines, in the form of processional ways) or social (cf. the importance of χορεία for the education of the citizen in Plato's *Laws*). As such, it can operate through actual choral performance or as a metaphor through the appropriation of its structures, images, and vocabulary in a non-choral milieu, such as epic poetry, or juridical procedures. The standard work on the archaic Greek chorus is Calame (2001). Cf. further Lonsdale (1993); Kowalzig (2007).

11 I am not concerned here with the specific mode of performance, choral or kitharodic, of Stesichorus' poetry. For my purposes, the presence of χορός in his name points unequivocally to the importance of chorality, at least at the conceptual level, even in a kitharodic performance. This, moreover, does not exclude the presence of the chorus dancing to the song of the kitharode, as in Demodocus' performance in the Phaeacian agora. The main exponents of the monodic theory are: West (1971); Haslam (1974) 32 ff.; Schade (2003) 6 ff.; Pallantza (2005) 91 f. Defenders of the choral performance: Burkert (1987) 43 ff.; Cingano (1993); D'Alfonso (1994); Nagy (1990) 362, 422; Power (2010) 234–243; Curtis (2011) 23–36. While acknowledging the strength of some of the arguments for the monodic theory, I still believe that the performance of Stesichorus' poetry was mainly choral.

12 For Stesichore as a variant to Hesiod's Terpsichore, cf. n. 8.

13 This feature of choral performance can be seen in the successive choruses described in the central part of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, namely those performed by the Ionians, the Deliades, and the Olympian gods, in a disposition I call a mimetic *mise-en-abyme*, in which

choice of such a name for a choral poet amounts to a strong claim to identification with a specific poetic tradition, which he would embody as its founder or at least as its paradigmatic author. We have some scant references to earlier authors, such as Xenocritus of Locri or Xanthus, which are sometimes cited as predecessors to Stesichorus' special brand of narrative choral poetry (Xanthus, for instance, is said to have composed an *Oresteia* which influenced Stesichorus). But whatever their precise status, the fact that Stesichorus is nominally cited alongside Homer in a poem by Simonides confirms the role assigned to him as the paramount representative of a poetic tradition by one of the leading authors of the succeeding generation, a fact that probably reflects a strong statement in Stesichorus' own oeuvre on the definition of the kind of poetry he claimed to represent, perhaps even to inaugurate. This foundational status is also suggested by the change of his name in the biographical tradition, from Tisias to Stesichorus, a motif that links him to the founder of cities, such as Aristoteles/Battos, the founder of Cyrene.[14]

The relationship of poet and Muse in connection with Hesiod obviously calls to mind the encounter between Hesiod and the Muses in the proem to the *Theogony*.[15] This is one of the models, I would argue, for the episode of Helen's wrath and Stesichorus' recantation through the *Palinode*. As many scholars, including most recently A. Kelly and E. Bowie, have suggested, the episode of the poet's blinding and recovery of sight must have been told in the poem, and may even, as Sider thinks, have been dramatized somehow by the poet

the interchangeability of all the parties involved is emphasized. Any of the successive audiences at the annual festival at Delos would take the dancing Ionians, honoring the gods in their songs, for the gods themselves, or the singing Delian girls for the particular audience watching them at any of those occasions. For the use of this device in choral lyric, see S. Harden's chapter in this volume. For the mimetic nature of choral lyric and choral performance, cf. Nagy (1990) and Kowalzig (2007), among others.

14 TA 19 PMGF. Battos' change of name: Hdt. 4.155, Pind. *Pyth.* 5.87. The possibility also exists, of course, that Stesichorus was not a historic person, simply a generic name for this tradition of narrative choral poetry, but in that case we should expect a more ancient authorial figure, earlier than Xanthus, or even Alcman for that matter, one akin to Homer himself, Olympus, or Thamyris, rather than an author who, even taking into account the discrepancies regarding his homeland, his exact chronology and other (pseudo)biographical details, is firmly anchored in a late Archaic (sixth-century) context. His case seems to be rather comparable to those of Anacreon or Theognis, historical figures that have come to enshrine a specific kind of poetry, and whose oeuvre has eventually attracted pseudepigraphic works, sometimes of a much later date (among which, in Stesichorus' case, such poems as *Rhadine, Daphnis*, or *Kalyke* are probably to be counted).

15 Hes. *Th.* 23–34.

and/or the chorus.[16] Its function was primarily the self-definition of both poet and genre (as suggested by Stesichorus' name as paradigmatic representative of a particular kind of poetry). More specifically, it also expressed Stesichorus' bidding for panhellenic authority, in direct competition with epic, which was itself undergoing a process of change, as Burkert, among others, has convincingly shown.[17]

As in Hesiod, the issue of the poet's capacity to tell ἔτυμα and οὔκ ἔτυμα is put forth in the context of a divine epiphany: seeing Helen in a dream (or, according to other sources, which perhaps reflect different versions of the poem, being told by a Crotoniat soldier who had seen her on the island of Leuke). And the whole theme of truth or falsehood is linked to the relationship of Stesichorus' poetry to epic tradition, in an unprecedentedly radical departure that goes far beyond the specific thematic innovations we find in the rest of his work. A typical example of the "specific innovation" pattern can be found in the *Iliou Persis*: instead of dropping their swords on seeing Helen's face, the men who were on the point of stoning her dropped the stones they carried (fr. 106). The innovation in the *Palinode* is of a radically different kind. By removing the fundamental causal motif in the Trojan saga, the rape of Helen, it calls at least for a drastic reinterpretation of the whole myth, and by making this radical change the center and *raison d'être* of the poem itself, Stesichorus problematizes the very status and function both of the poem and of the poet.

The motif of the phantom Helen was probably introduced by Hesiod (perhaps, but not necessarily, in the *Catalogue of Women*). This is stated by an admittedly late source, but it seems confirmed by Chamaeleon's reference to the existence of two Stesichorean *Palinodes*, one of which criticized Hesiod's account of the story.[18] Moreover, if the *eidōlon* motif had already been introduced by the Hesiodic tradition, as stated by Irenaeus and implied by

16 Kelly (2007); Bowie (2010); Sider (1989). Davies and Finglass (2014) 312–313 are skeptical: though the story "might derive at some remove from the poem," "there may well have been no reference to blindness there at all." For a detailed commentary of the numerous ancient sources relating the story of Stesichorus' blindness, see Ercoles (2013) 306–341.

17 Burkert (1987). Beecroft (2006) studies Stesichorus' *Palinode* from the perspective of the tension between panhellenic and epichoric.

18 Fr. 90 (= P. Oxy. 2506). Cf. Hes. fr. 358 MW. Davies and Finglass (2014) do not believe that the *eidōlon* motif appeared in Hesiod. They cast doubt on the reliability of the Byzantine source (a paraphrase of Lycophron's *Alexandra*) and contend that the second *Palinode*, that in which he criticized Hesiod, did not concern Helen. But this contention overlooks both Irenaeus' explicit statement that Stesichorus' *Palinodes* (in the plural) eulogized Helen (fr. 91i) and the absence of any reference to a *Palinode* by Stesichorus concerning any other story. Moreover, the emphatic wording διτταὶ γάρ εἰσι παλινωιδίαι διαλλάττουσαι

Chamaeleon's reference to the existence of two Stesichorean *Palinodes*, criticizing Homer and Hesiod, respectively, the strong link of Stesichorus to that tradition would be all the more evident. In any case, by its very uniqueness, which was acknowledged in antiquity as early as Plato, the *Palinode* seems to have had a programmatic intention: it made a statement about the kind of poetry Stesichorus' poetic voice meant to represent and the kind of relationship it meant to establish with other poetic traditions, both epic and lyric.

With respect to the relationship between the poet and the Muses, the episode of Stesichorus' blinding and recovery of sight through his poetry alludes to two other epic models besides Hesiod. The first is negative, that of Thamyris punished by the Muses by losing the ability to sing and suffering some kind of mutilation.[19] The second is a positive one, that of Demodocus' poetic gifts received as compensation for his blindness, both conditions accorded to him by the Muse.[20] Divine punishment of the poet in the first case, blindness as a foil to poetic ability in the second, are relevant points of comparison to Stesichorus in the *Palinode*, not least because they highlight the difference and specificity of the new poetic *persona* being defined, which once again, as we shall see, goes in the direction of highlighting and developing the performative implications of chorality.

After stating the existence of two *Palinodes*, the anonymous commentator in the papyrus goes on to cite the initial invocations at the beginning of each poem, in which the poet addresses a female divinity, presumably the Muse, as θεὰ φιλόμολπε and χρυσόπτερε παρθένε, respectively.[21] This confirms the close

in the papyrus seems to stress two alternative versions of the same story, rather than two completely unrelated poems. As for the content of the Hesiodic account, Cingano (1982) 32 conjectures that it would have told of Helen's rape at Sparta, as in the traditional version (if that were the case the statement of her guilt in fr. 176.7 MW would not be problematic, since the introduction of the phantom would not have exonerated her), but it would have had Helen accompany Paris only as far as Egypt, where the *eidōlon* was introduced. This could have been the source of Herodotus' account (2.113–117), which also diverges from the traditional version only after the couple's arrival at Egypt. The suppression of the phantom motif in Herodotus should be seen as a rationalization of the Hesiodic version, on the same lines as the retelling of several rape myths (Io, Europa, Helen again) at the beginning of his work. There, as here, these "corrected" versions are attributed to foreign (Persian or Egyptian) informers.

19 *Il.* 2.594–600. The meaning of πηρόν at 599 is obscure. For Thamyris, see Grau (2002), Wilson (2009), as well as Liapis in this volume.

20 *Od.* 8.62–64.

21 I do not wish to enter here into a detailed discussion of this issue, but two alternative possibilities should at least be mentioned. First, the two invocations could perhaps belong

link between the poet and the Muse, which was implicit, as we have seen, in his chosen name. However, in the *Palinode* it is Helen herself, the main character of the narration, who takes on the role played by the Muses as a chorus in the epic passages on Demodocus and Thamyris. Thus, the episode of the slander against Helen and the resulting punishment of the poet effectively transfers to Helen the crucial elements of the traditional relationship between the epic poet and the Muses. In this context the shift from the Muses to Helen parallels the shift from epic poetry to the genre of narrative choral poetry represented by Stesichorus. Four features of Helen are especially relevant here, as they have important implications for the definition of the new genre:[22]

1. First, of course, her radiant looks, epitomized by her irresistible gaze, as well as in the desire-fraught gaze she awakens in others. Thus, in the two episodes in *Iliad* 3 that concern her, we see her first, in the *teikhoskopia*, appearing at the walls in an almost epiphanic way before the amazed eyes of the elders;[23] then, in her remarkable encounter with Aphrodite, we see her mediating between, on the one hand, the *ommata marmaironta* of the goddess, whom she recognizes and calls by her name (ἐκ τ' ὀνόμαζε), even under the disguise of old age, and, on the other hand, the radiant looks of Paris, who is compared to a beautiful youth either about to go to the chorus or having just returned from it.[24] The allusion to the chorus is particularly relevant here, as it functions as a choral marker hinting at the choral undertones that impregnate the whole episode.[25] Between the goddess of *himeros* and *charis* celebrated in the *choros* (Aphrodite) and the *choreutēs* taking part in the dance (Paris), Helen

---

to the beginning of the two parts of a single poem in the form of a diptych, which, due to this peculiarity, could be known alternately as the *Palinode* or the *Palinodes*. Second, though the Muse is the likeliest candidate as the addressee of the two invocations, other options are possible, especially for the second: χρυσόπτερε παρθένε. *Chrysopteros* is an epic epithet exclusively applied to Iris, who could conceivably be addressed here as a carrier of the message of Helen's wrath. Other possibilities that have been put forward include a Siren, a Sphinx, or Helen herself: see Ercoles (2013) 320 n. 422.

22 In a recent paper, I have examined at greater length the characteristics of Helen in epic that made her important for the definition of Stesichorus' persona and poetry: Carruesco (2012). On Helen, cf. further Suzuki (1989); Austin (1994); Pantelia (2002); Elmer (2005); Roisman (2006); Carruesco (2009); Blondell (2010a, 2010b).

23 *Il.* 3.154 ff., esp. 166, 234 f. For a metaliterary reading of Helen in the *teikhoskopia*, see Elmer (2005).

24 *Il.* 3.390–398. On this episode, see Taplin (1992) 96–109; Roisman (2006); Blondell (2010a).

25 The choral undertones of this important episode, which are not obvious at first sight but must have been evident to a contemporary Greek audience, are analyzed in Carruesco (2009).

mediates as the prototype of the *chorēgos*. But the wrath of the goddess threatens to radically subvert her function as leader of the chorus, which should be the peaceful articulation of the onlookers through ritualized competition.[26] Now, in Aphrodite's words, Helen would indeed be placed in the middle (μέσσῳ δ'ἀμφοτέρων), but as an object not of desire but of destructive hatred for Trojans and Greeks alike. And, finally, the choleric threat of the goddess ultimately reinforces Helen's power of seduction, once she has recanted her slanderous words, and Paris is seized by her appearance as when he contemplated her for the first time.

This episode, I would argue, offers a relevant model for Helen's wrath and Stesichorus' blindness, which has to be read, as the poet's name suggests, in a choral key, as the dramatization of the potential collapse of the poet's authority, and conversely, through recantation, of the emphatic reassertion of that authority, as though he had obtained it for the first time. For Thamyris the punishment consists primarily in forgetting the song, for Demodocus blindness can accompany song, even perhaps enhance it, but for a Setter-up-of-the-Chorus, Stesichorus, who has to impersonate the *chorēgos* and organize and lead the figures of the dance, deprivation of sight would mean the disappearance of the active *charis* essential for the multiple connections this poetry aspires to establish between the *chorēgos*, the *choreutai* and, ultimately, the *dēmos*. Thus, the proem of the *Oresteia* styles Stesichorus' poetry as Χαρίτων δαμώματα καλλικόμων, "public songs of the lovely-haired Graces."[27] I do not need to dwell on the importance of sight in choral poetry; let it suffice to cite two well-known expressions from Alcman's *partheneion* alluding to the *chorēgos* and showing the impossibility of a blind choral poet: "I sing now of the light that is Agido's; bright I see it as the very sun's which the same Agido now invoketh to shine upon us" and, even more essentially, ἦ οὐχ' ὁρῆις; ("Can't you see it?").[28]

2. A second important feature of Helen in this connection is her mimetic (or perhaps we should rather say metamorphic) voice, as shown in Menelaus' story in the *Odyssey*, where, after having walked thrice around the Wooden Horse, she tries to lure the Greek warriors inside to betray themselves by imitating

26 Cf. the dance of the Phaeacian youth in the agora in *Od.* 8 (especially 247–253, where the agonistic context is clearly defined). The display and the recognition by Odysseus of the excellence of the Phaeacians in dance has as a result the end of the *neikos* between Euryalos and Odysseus and the establishment of a strong bond of *charis* between the *xenos* and his hosts.

27 Fr. 173.

28 Alcm. 1.39–43; 50.

their wives' voices.[29] This is a complex story, which I have analyzed in detail in a previous paper, so I will but summarize the conclusions here: Helen's mimetic, hence multiple, voice in this episode can be related both to the choral voices of the Muses in the proem to the Catalogue of Ships, and to that of the Sirens in the *Odyssey*. In these cases a choral voice is set against the single voice of the epic *aoidos*, in the first passage, or its surrogate, Odysseus, in the second poem. This is also the case in the Trojan Horse episode, which suggests that Helen's metamorphic voice there, if not choral in a literal sense, is equally presented in terms that are meant to be understood as representing the choral paradigm. This choral reading is further confirmed by the fact that this Odyssean passage will inform, in turn, even in its phrasing,[30] the famous episode of the encounter between the blind man of Chios and the Deliades, with their uncanny power of imitating the audience's voices and their κρεμβαλιαστύς, which, following Peponi, I agree should be understood as a choreographic reference, a reference to the patterns of the dance.[31] The relevance of these links to Stesichorus' Helen may not seem obvious at first sight. However, it will become clearer once we consider the other features of the epic Helen that I am discussing here.

3. Helen's special knowledge, which extends far beyond that of a surrogate of the poet and compares her rather to his divine models, the Muses and the Sirens, as seen both in *Iliad* 3 and in *Odyssey* 4 and 15, where she is even cast as a *mantis*. More precisely, time and again she excels at recognizing and identifying by their individual names all those she encounters or looks upon, be it the Greek warriors from the walls (*Il.* 3.166: ἐξονομήνηις; 235: οὕς κεν ἐῢ γνοίην καί τ' οὔνομα μυθησαίμην), Aphrodite or Odysseus under their disguises (*Il.* 3.398: ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε; *Od.* 4.250: ἐγὼ δέ μιν οἴη ἀνέγνων), Telemachus upon his arrival in Sparta (*Od.* 4.140–143, 148: ὡς σὺ ἐΐσκεις), or the wives of the Achaeans, whom she calls by their individual names (note the emphasis on the term *onoma*): ἐκ δ' ὀνομακλήδην Δαναῶν ὀνόμαζες ἀρίστους, / πάντων Ἀργείων φωνὴν ἴσκουσ' ἀλόχοισιν (*Od.* 4.278–279).

Like Hesiod's Muses, or Sappho's Aphrodite, addressing the Lesbian poetess in her own name, I think that this points to a similar pattern in Helen's words to Stesichorus in the *Palinode*, in which she probably addressed him by

29 *Od.* 4.269–289. Cf. Carruesco (2012).

30 *Hymn. Hom. Apoll.*, 162–164: πάντων δ' ἀνθρώπων φωνὰς καὶ κρεμβαλιαστὺν / μιμεῖσθ' ἴσασιν· φαίη δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος / φθέγγεσθ'· οὕτω σφιν καλὴ συνάρηρεν ἀοιδή. Cf. *Od.* 4.278–283, especially 278–279: ἐκ δ' ὀνομακλήδην Δαναῶν ὀνόμαζες ἀρίστους, / πάντων Ἀργείων φωνὴν ἴσκουσ' ἀλόχοισιν·

31 On the precise nature of the Deliades' imitative capacity, and the meaning of κρεμβαλιαστύς, see Pòrtulas (1996); Peponi (2009).

his name while warning him of her wrath, and that also in this case it meant a self-defining moment both for the poet's persona and the poetry he embodies: Stēsi-khoros, He-who-sets-up-the-chorus. According to the *Suda*, his real name was Tisias but since "he was the first to establish a chorus of singers to the cithara," he was called Stesichorus, though we are not told by whom.[32] Following the Hesiodic example, the most probable context for this "invention of Stesichorus," that is, for the inauguration of a new poetic tradition embodied in its archetypal poet, is in one of his poems, in the context of a programmatic statement couched in (auto)biographical terms. The *Palinode* is the likeliest candidate.

4. The last, and crucial, feature of Helen to consider here, essentially related to the possession of such complete knowledge as we have just seen, is her duplicity, or rather the double nature both of her figure and her discourse, including the total control over truth and falsehood, which again links her to the Muses. We may note the double question she utters before correctly identifying Telemachus, ψεύσομαι ἦ ἔτυμον ἐρέω (*Od.* 4.140, cf. ibid. 157: ἐτήτυμον, ὡς ἀγορεύεις), and compare it to the single phrase uttered by Penelope to Eurycleia: ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅδε μῦθος ἐτήτυμος (*Od.* 23.62). This is almost exactly the wording of the famous verse in Stesichorus' *Palinode*: οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος. The reference would have been inescapable for any audience, but at the same time it should have raised some unsettling questions, as Penelope's statement, refusing to believe in Odysseus' return, is manifestly false. In the same sense, the double stories in *Odyssey* 4, that of Helen's helping Odysseus at Troy, as told by her, and that of her attempt to betray the Achaeans in the Horse, recounted by Menelaus, are a paramount example of her essential duplicity. By carefully avoiding helping the audience decide the truth or falsehood of each version, the poet of the *Odyssey* characteristically thematizes that duplicity and relates it to the truth or falsehood of the narration. From this perspective, the two contradictory stories about Helen's implication in the war in the *Odyssey* are a clear precedent for the splitting of Helen herself in the *Palinode*.

Indeed, all the elements mentioned so far are important to the understanding of Stesichorus' strategy in the *Palinode*. I agree with Karen Bassi in considering that the palinodic pattern, even as it states the falsehood of the first story and the truth of the *eidōlon* tale, does not cancel but somehow preserves and supersedes that version by including both in a double pattern, which is ἀληθής, 'true', in a different sense than simply ἔτυμον.[33] A clear precedent for this

32 TA 19 PMGF. On the historical existence of Stesichorus, cf. n. 14.

33 Bassi (1993).

strategy in epic is the tale of the two Erides at the beginning of *Works and Days*, which begins by explicitly disavowing the single Eris version of the *Theogony*:

> κλῦθι ἰδὼν αἰων τε, δίκῃ δ' ἴθυνε θέμιστας
> τύνη· ἐγὼ δέ κε Πέρσῃ ἐτήτυμα μυθησαίμην.
> οὐκ ἄρα μοῦνον ἔην Ἐρίδων γένος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν
> εἰσὶ δύω· τὴν μέν κεν ἐπαινήσειε νοήσας,
> ἡ δ' ἐπιμωμητή· διὰ δ' ἄνδιχα θυμὸν ἔχουσιν.
>
> HES. *W&D* 9–13

> Give ear to me, watching and listening, and straighten the verdicts with justice yourself; as for me, I will proclaim truths to Perses. So there was not just one birth of Strifes after all, but upon the earth there are two Strifes. One of these a man would praise once he got to know it, but the other is blameworhy; and they have thoroughly opposed spirits.
>
> tr. GLENN MOST

Here, too, the new version consists of the duplication of a single goddess into two divine entities, one worthy of *epainos*, the other of *mômos*; and here, too, even though this *mythos* is deemed ἐτήτυμος, the result is not so much a cancelling of the first version, which continues to be true in the context of *Theogony*, but rather a refashioning of the tale to adapt it to a new poem, which is to say, to a new occasion: the didactic poem on *dikē* addressed both to Perses and the *basileis dōrophagoi* in the context of a city in conflict. Similarly, I would argue that the *Palinode* can be viewed as a programmatic statement of the poet's authority, presenting a radical instance of the capability of Stesichorean poetry to simultaneously appropriate the panhellenic material of epic and fashion it in different ways to adapt to different and successive occasions of performance, be it at Sparta, or at Locri, or at both places (as possible locations of the two poems, if there were two different *Palinodes*, or of the reperformance of the *Palinode* for a new occasion, possibly with some modifications or additions), or, by extension, anywhere. This, perhaps, could be the meaning of the allusion in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus to the existence of two *Palinodes*, the incorporation into the text of the poem of the traces of two different occasions, with the implication of an ongoing variability projecting into future reperformances, as in traditional oral poetry, but at the same time a variability which is now inscribed in the structure of the text and can thus reconcile oral reperformance with written fixation and textual stabilization.[34]

34 This process was of course not specific to choral, occasion-related poetry; it affected

In this sense, I would call attention to the somewhat strange and emphatic wording of the commentator's statement of this fact (perhaps echoing Chamaeleon's own wording):[35] διτταὶ γάρ εἰσι παλινωιδ⟨ίαι δια⟩λλάττουσαι.[36] This can be understood in two ways: a) a *dissoi logoi* pattern, similar to that found in *Od.* 4, with two contradictory stories as two versions of the same poem, reciprocally related in a pattern of alternation or conciliation (*diallattousai*),[37] in which the episode of Helen's wrath and Stesichorus' blinding and recovery of sight would have occupied a central place, in a similar structure to that of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo;[38] b) two different *Palinodes* as alternative refashionings of the panhellenic epic version, each corresponding to a different performance occasion. It is difficult to choose between these options on the scant evidence we have. Whatever the case, this remarkable composition or compositions offered an original answer to the generally perceived

---

no less—although in a different way—contemporary epic poetry, as can be seen in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, which combines a Delian and a Delphian hymn into a single poem. Burkert (1987) sees this work and Stesichorean poetry as competing responses to a similar context, in which changes in the relationship between oral performance and written fixation rendered problematic the traditional foundations of the poet's authority.

35 The credibility of this statement has divided the scholarship since the publication of the papyrus. Among the upholders of the existence of two different *Palinodes* are Bowra (1963); Doria (1963); Sisti (1965); Davison (1966); Oliveira Pulquério (1973/74); Cingano (1982). The single work theory has been defended by, among others, Leone (1964/68); Farina (1968); Bertini (1970); Sider (1989); Woodbury (1991); Kelly (2007).

36 Stesich., fr. 90 (= P. Oxy. 2506). I give the text with the supplement of Lobel, though it must be noted that the text as found in the papyrus is more complex, with traces of a first version (διττὰ ἐστι … ἀλλάττουσαι) subsequently corrected. On this issue, see Bowie (2010).

37 As a variant of this model, in Carruesco (2012) I further consider the possibility that the *Helen* and the two *Palinodes* could have formed a single work in three parts, a tripartite structure echoing the triadic metrical pattern of the poem. A narration of the "orthodox" version of Helen's rape could have been followed, after the dramatization of Helen's wrath, by a double recantation, in two steps, refuting first Homer's version (Helen was replaced by her phantom), then Hesiod's (Helen didn't even go to Egypt), and ending with the recovery of the poet's sight. This would account for the word πᾶσαν in Plato's account: only after completing the *whole* palinode (that is, the two recantations) was Stesichorus healed.

38 It is important to note that this poem represents, in Burkert's view, the parallel model in the competing epic tradition contemporary to Stesichorus' choral (or kitharodic) poetry. Likewise, the *Palinode* seems to me to have been a crucial programmatic text in this context of genre competition and redefinition.

need to maintain and redefine on new grounds the necessary openness and fluidity of the poetic tradition on its aspiration to truth, in a time in which this was increasingly challenged by new phenomena such as written fixation or new competing discourses, such as philosophy (and, shortly after, history and drama).

What remains now is to put the emphasis on the specificity of the Stesichorean model, which lies in its reappropriation of chorality as poetic paradigm from its use by the epic poet,[39] and the potentialization of the performative aspects of choral mimesis. In a previous paper I have tried to individuate some of these aspects in the choral scenes on the Shield of Achilles and on Geometric vases, particularly the multilayered levels of representation perceived by the onlookers: the beauty of the dancers, the mythic or symbolic meanings evoked by their song, and the abstract patterns of the dance.[40] In choral lyric this can also be seen in, e.g., Alcman's *Partheneion*, in which the question "Don't you see?" is answered first by a symbolic image, the Enetic horse, and only then by the description of the real *chorēgos*' beauty. Likewise, the beauty of the dancers finds its objective correlate in the detailed description of their jewels and attire (or, in the chorus on the Shield in Achilles, the girls' garlands and the boys' daggers), valuable objects (*agalmata*) displayed in the performance and in the text being sung, that function as symbolic counterpart to the dancers and their aristocratic status.

In Stesichorus we have already seen the importance of the visual dimension, underlined by Helen's beauty and Stesichorus' recovery of sight. But while in choral language Helen epitomizes the beauty of the *chorēgos* and the *choreutai*, as an epic heroine and the main character of the narrative she transfers both that beauty and its ambiguous overtones of seduction and deceitfulness to the narration itself. Her new double status as goddess and *eidōlon*, immobile and mobile, true and false, gives a new and complex expression to the different levels of choral representation. On the one hand, this corresponds to the importance of visual, even ecphrastic, elements in Stesichorean narration of myth, which finds sriking parallels in the iconography of black figure vases.[41] We can cite, among a plethora of examples, Heracles crossing the Ocean in the cup of the Sun, the death of Geryon, Heracles wrestling with a

39 This was the case not only in the Hesiodic tradition, but also in Homer, as clearly stated in *Il.* 2.484–493, 594–600.

40 Carruesco (2016).

41 This emphasis on the visual dimension may also account for his equally important influence on the theater, which is essentially a choral genre.

metamorphic sea creature,[42] or such iconographical details as the highlighting of *episēmata* on the heroes' shields.[43]

On the other hand, the more abstract level of representation, as found in choral performance in the *schēmata* of the dance, also seems to have been emphasized and developed in Stesichorean poetry.[44] This aspect has also found a way into the definition of Stesichorus' poetic persona in the biographic notice of Stesichorus' brother being an important geometer between Thales and Pythagoras, or in the proverbial sayings "Stesichorus' three" and "eight all," seemingly referring to his invention of triadic responsion and to the geometrically rigorous form of his tomb at Catane.[45] In this emphasis on the importance of numbers and geometry we can see as much a traditional element, belonging to the very definition of choral performance (cf. the self-reference of Alcman's chorus in the first partheneion as a δεκάς), as an innovation within that tradition, parallel to the development of mathematical thought, between Milesian physics and the Pythagorean mystic of numbers.[46]

If we turn now from the poet's persona to his poetry, triadic structure, though admittedly no clear proof of an actual choral performance, is the best example of this transfer of choral schemes to the structure of the discourse, to the extent that it visualizes the medium of song itself. In this respect, more attention should be paid to the term *palinôidía* itself, which seems to have been a creation of Stesichorus to designate his poem.[47] The term πάλιν applies

---

42 In a black figure cup in the Museo Nazionale di Tarquinia (Tarquinia RC4194), this mythical episode is set, significantly, within a choral frame, a maiden dance that perhaps represents the chorus of the Nereids.

43 Stesichorus described that of Odysseus, representing a dolphin: fr. 290. We may cite in this respect the central episode of Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* as a probable instance of the influence of Stesichorean choral imaging both on iconography and drama.

44 Here again, the cup mentioned in n. 43 can furnish an iconographic parallel, in the geometric stylization of the fighters' hands, at the very center of the heroic narration framed by the representation of a choral performance.

45 TB22C; TA36–37.

46 A summary of Pythagorean connections in Stesichorus' biographical tradition in West (1971) 302–305. The issue of numbers and numerical or geometric patterns in choral (and particularly Stesichorean) poetry is an important subject, which requires a more detailed discussion than is possible here.

47 In Carruesco (2012) I argued for the likelihood that Stesichorus used the term *palinodia* (or an equivalent phrase, such as πάλιν ἀείδω, which could be later seen as characteristic of the poem and used as its title, in a similar way to Hesiod's *Ehoeae*). In any case, it was commonly known even before Plato, as implied by the phrasing of the expression τὴν καλουμένην παλινῳδίαν, which we find both in the *Phaedrus* and in Isocrates' *Encomium of Helen*.

primarily to a local notion, a reversal in the direction of movement, as in πάλιν χωρεῖν or, in *Il.* 3.33, in the compound παλίνορσος, to describe someone retracing his steps after having seen a serpent. In this sense, the notion of a song that moves in the opposite direction of a previous one evokes a choral movement of strophe and antistrophe. Thus, as a programmatic statement, the *Palinode* would have highlighted the visualization of the medium by combining the triadic microstructure of the Stesichorean discourse with the dual, palinodic macrostructure of the whole narration.

But other aspects of the Reversed Song are brought up by some related uses of πάλιν in the Homeric poems. In the *Iliad*, Agamemnon takes back his words of *psogos* to Odysseus to placate his anger at them: ὡς γνῶ χωομένοιο· πάλιν δ' ὅ γε λάζετο μῦθον (*Il.* 4.357). Even more interestingly, at *Od.* 13.254, the same phrase is used in opposition to ἀληθέα to describe one of the false stories of Odysseus, told to Athena herself: οὐδ' ὅ γ' ἀληθέα εἶπε, πάλιν δ' ὅ γε λάζετο μῦθον.[48] The tracing back of his words is here similar to the ψεύδεα ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα of Hesiod's Muses. In this sense, if *Il.* 4.357 goes unproblematically in the same direction of Stesichorus' recantation of what he had said in the *Helen*, *Od.* 13.254 shows it the other way round, when the μῦθος corresponds to the οὐκ ἔτυμος. In Stesichorus' *Palinode*, this parallel accounts for the paradox of an ἔτυμος λόγος purifying both Helen from the stain of adultery and Stesichorus from impiety, at the cost of introducing a false appearance, the εἴδωλον of Helen: thus, the content of the *etymos logos* is the deceitful *eidōlon*. In the same sense, the textual allusion to Penelope's manifestly false words in the *Odyssey* undermines the assertion "this is not a true story" and leaves open the possibility of viewing the *Palinode* as a *dissoi logoi* structure, where truth and untruth are not as clear-cut as we are being told.

In terms of the poet's authority, this paradoxical duplicity must be interpreted as the achievement of total control over truth and falsehood, the power of the Hesiodic Muses.[49] In terms of genre, it is the expression of the complex relationship that Stesichorean poetry entertains with the epic tradition, its model as well as its main competitor. In that context, the *Palinode* seems to have been a strong programmatic statement, as suggested both by its departure

---

48 Cf. *Il.* 1.526, where Zeus' head signal is not παλινάγρετον, for if it were so, it would also be ἀπατηλόν.

49 In this, however, Stesichorus is probably following the lead of Hesiod himself, who in the *Works and Days* had in practice appropriated that power, which the Muses reserved for themselves in the *Theogony*, when modifying his account of the single Eris. And a further precedent can be found in the Hesiodic tradition if indeed the story of Helen's *eidōlon* was already to be found there.

from Stesichorus' normal practice in other poems (to judge from the remaining fragments, which seem to conform to the "specific innovation" pattern, with no thematization of the innovation itself and no allusion to the discarded version) and by the popularity of the story in antiquity. Innovation is indeed a staple of all Greek poetry, but both the profound questioning of the Trojan myth that the radical innovation of the *Palinode* entailed and the thematization of such a diametrical change of the discourse and its implications for the poet's relation to the relative values of truth and falsehood must have been perceived as something new, amounting to a strong programmatic claim on the foundations of the poet's authority.

As such, the poem seems to have had an important influence in later times. Thus, within the specific medium of choral song, in lyric as well as in drama, the importance of Stesichorus' *Palinode* lies in the new approaches to mythic innovation, while retaining the poets' claim to authority in the community, to be observed in the Classical period both in the Attic tragedians (cf., e.g., the sometimes radical Euripidean changes to traditional myths, as in his *Electra*, or, indeed, his *Helen*) and in the odes of Pindar (as in his mutually contradictory retellings of Neoptolemus' death according to different performance occasions).

But we can trace this influence also in hexametric poetry, especially in that of the Presocratics, where we see an enhanced emphasis on the double ways of the poem and the poet's ability to master both; and where, related to this, we notice a renewed claim about the performative efficacity of the poem, that is, the effect of the poem's performance on the world in which it was performed.[50] Thus, Stesichorus' *Palinode* furnishes a precedent to Parmenides' two alternative ways, that of Aletheia and that of Doxa (which is in turn presented, significantly, as formed by *palintrapeloi keleuthoi*). It is also a fundamental model for Empedocles' poem, essentially double (διπλ' ἐρέω, "I will tell a double tale").[51] The exposing of two different levels of reality, that of the physical elements and that of the exiled *daimones*, culminates in a presentation of the power of the poem to heal, even to resuscitate, and to calm or excite the winds at will, which recalls the power of the *Palinode* to restore Stesichorus' sight, or the story of

50 Most clearly stated in Empedocles' work; cf. fr. 111DK.

51 The "palinodic principle" is expressed still more clearly at the beginning of fr. 35 DK: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ παλίνορσος ἐλεύσομαι ἐς πόρον ὕμνων, τὸν πρότερον κατέλεξα, λόγου λόγον ἐξοχετεύων. While here it is presented as a compositional device, the emphatic use of another *palin*-compound in 111.5 DK points to this structural feature of the poem being linked to its alleged effect on physical reality, as it matches that reality's own inner structure: καὶ πάλιν, ἢν ἐθέληισθα, παλίντιτα πνεύματ' ἐπάξεις·

his avoiding a war through the music of his poems, restoring *hesychia*.[52] In this respect, it is no coincidence that Plato refers to the *Palinode* as a καθαρμός (precisely the name of Empedocles' poem, or of one of his poems),[53] pointing to a new emphasis on the choral poet's authority that Plato now claims for the philosopher.

The conspicuous evoking of the *Palinode* story in the *Phaedrus* involves yet another reappropriation of chorality to fashion a new genre, the philosophical dialogue, in which it is put in the service of Plato's own redefinition of τὸ ἀληθές.[54] In this context of genre definition and competition, at roughly the same time, Isocrates, too, was using Stesichorus' *Palinode* for his own rhetorical program in his *Encomium to Helen*, polemicizing as much with the sophists of the previous generation, particularly Gorgias, as with the competing program of philosophical education offered by Plato.[55]

The authors just mentioned attest to the deep and lasting influence of Stesichorus' poetic statement in the *Palinode*. By appropriating the duplicity of the epic Helen and couching it in a specifically choral medium, and by transferring to her the main elements of the traditional definition of the relationship between the epic poet and the chorus of the Muses, as found especially in Hesiod, Stesichorus succeeded both in redefining the poet's authority on new foundations and in reconciling the claims to panhellenic truth of the epic narration with the epichoric, ritually-based, and occasion-related variability of choral performance, a double lesson which was certainly not to be lost on Pindar.[56]

Bibliography

Austin, N. 1994. *Helen of Troy and her Shameless Phantom*. Ithaca.

Bassi, K. 1993. "Helen and the Discourse of Denial in Stesichorus' Palinode." *Arethusa* 26: 51–75.

52 TA 12 PMGF.

53 Nor is it a coincidence that Empedocles' work presents us with a similar problem in regard to the number of poems.

54 On the function of the allusion to the *Palinode* in the *Phaedrus*, cf. Demos (1997).

55 Isocr. 10. 64 = Stesich., fr. 91c. On the problematic relationship between the proem and the encomium to Helen, already remarked on by Aristotle, cf. Papillon (1996).

56 We may cite here his very different treatment of Neoptolemus in *Paean* 6 and *Nemean* 7, or of Bellerophon in *Olympian* 13 and *Isthmian* 7, according to the different contexts and audiences of each performance, as well as his frequent claims to authority, largely based on his mastery of *kairos*.

Beecroft, A. 2006. "'This is not a True Story': Stesichorus' Palinode and the Revenge of the Epichoric." TAPA 156: 47–70.

Bertini, F. 1970. "L'εἴδωλον di Elena." In *Mythos. Scripta in honorem Marii Untersteiner*, 81–96. Genova.

Blondell, R. 2010a. "'Bitch That I Am': Self-Blame and Self-Assertion in the *Iliad*", TAPA 140: 1–32.

Blondell, R. 2010b. "Refractions of Homer's Helen in Archaic Lyric." *AJPh* 131: 349–391.

Bowie, E.L. 2010. "Performing and Re-Performing Helen: Stesichorus' Palinode." In *Mito y performance. De Grecia a la modernidad*, ed. A.M. González de Tobía, 385–408. La Plata.

Bowra, C.M. 1963. "The Two Palinodes of Stesichorus." CR n.s. 13: 245–252.

Burkert, W. 1987. "The Making of Homer in the 6th Century BC: Rhapsodes versus Stesichorus." In *Papers on the Amasis Painter and His World*, Getty Museum, 43–62. Malibu (= *Kleine Schriften I. Homerica*, Göttingen 2001: 198–217).

Calame, C. 2001. *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece*. Lanham, MD.

Carruesco, J. 2009. "La colère d'Aphrodite et d'Hélène dans la poésie grecque archaïque." In *Clémence et Châtiment*, ed. S.H. Aufrère and M. Mazoyer, 39–47. Paris.

Carruesco, J. 2010. "Prácticas rituales y modos del discurso: la coralidad como paradigma del catálogo en la poesía arcaica griega." *Actas del XII Congreso Nacional de Estudios Clásicos. Vol. II*, 271–277. València.

Carruesco, J. 2012. "Helen's Voice and Choral Mimesis from Homer to Stesichorus." In *Approaches to Archaic Greek Poetry* (*Orione. Testi e studi di letteratura greca*), ed. X. Riu and J. Pòrtulas, 149–172. Messina.

Carruesco, J. 2016. "Choral Performance and Geometric Patterns in Epic Poetry and Iconographic Representations." In *The Look of Lyric: Greek Song and the Visual* (*Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, vol. 1*), ed. V. Cazzato and A.P. Lardinois, 69–107. Leiden.

Cingano, E. 1982. "Quante testimonianze sulle palinodie di Stesicoro?" QUCC 41: 21–33.

Cingano, E. 1993. "Indizi di esecuzione corale in Stesicoro." In *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'eta ellenistica*, ed. R. Pretagostini, 347–361. Roma.

Curtis, P. 2011. *Stesichoros's* Geryoneis. Leiden.

D'Alfonso, F. 1994. *Stesicoro e la performance: studio sulle modalità esecutive dei carmi stesicorei*. Roma.

Davies, M., and P.J. Finglass. 2014. *Stesichorus: The Poems*. Cambridge.

Davison, J.A. 1966. "De Helena Stesichori." QUCC 2: 80–90.

Demos, M. 1997. "Stesichorus' Palinode in the *Phaedrus*." CW 90: 235–249.

Doria, M. 1963. "Le due Palinodie di Stesicoro." PP 18: 81–93.

Elmer, D.F. 2005. "Helen *Epigrammatopoios*." CA 24: 1–39.

Ercoles, M. 2013. *Stesicoro. Le testimonianze antiche* (*Eikasmos Studi, 24*). Bologna.

Farina, A. 1968. *Studi Stesicorei. Parte prima: il mito di Elena*. Napoli.

Finglass, P.J., and A. Kelly, eds. 2015. *Stesichorus in Context*. Cambridge.
Grau, S. 2002. "Tàmiris el traci." *Ítaca* 18: 129–190.
Haslam, M.W. 1974. "Stesichorean Metre." *QUCC* 17: 7–57.
Haslam, M.W. 1991. "Kleitias, Stesichoros, and the Jar of Dionysos." *TAPA* 121: 35–45.
Janko, R. 1986. "The Shield of Heracles and the Legend of Cycnus." *CQ* 36: 38–59.
Kelly, A. 2007. "Stesikhoros and Helen." *MH* 64: 1–21.
Kelly, A. 2015. "Stesichorus' Homer." In Finglass and Kelly 2015, 21–44.
Kowalzig, B. 2007. *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford.
Leone, P. 1964/68. "La Palinodia di Stesicoro." *AFLN* 11: 5–28.
Lonsdale, S. 1993. *Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion*. Baltimore.
Nagy, G. 1990. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.
Nagy, G. 1999. *The Best of the Achaeans. Revised Edition*. Baltimore.
Oliveira Pulquério, M. 1973/74. "O problema das duas Palinodias de Stesicoro." *Humanitas* 25/26: 265–273.
Pallantza, E. 2005. *Der Troische Krieg in der nachhomerischen Literatur bis zum 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr, HERMES-Einzelschriften 94*. Stuttgart.
Pantelia, M.C. 2002. "Helen and the Last Song for Hector." *TAPA* 132: 21–27.
Papillon, T.L. 1996. "Isocrates on Gorgias and Helen: The Unity of the *Helen*." *CJ* 91: 377–391.
Peponi, A.-E. 2009. "*Choreia* and Aesthetics in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*: The Performance of the Delian Maidens (Lines 156–164)." *CA* 28: 39–70.
Pòrtulas, J. 1996. "Le Fanciulle di Delo." *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 62: 437–443.
Power, T. 2010. *The Culture of* Kitharôidia. Washington.
Roisman, H.M. 2006. "Helen in the *Iliad*; *Causa Belli* and Victim of War: From Silent Weaver to Public Speaker." *AJPh* 127: 1–36.
Schade, G. 2003. *Stesichorus. Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 2359, 3876, 2619, 2803*. Leiden.
Sider, D. 1989. "The Blinding of Stesichorus." *Hermes* 117: 423–431.
Sider, D. 2010. "Greek Verse on a Vase by Douris." *Hesperia* 79: 541–554.
Sisti, F. 1965. "Le due Palinodie di Stesicoro." *QUCC* 39: 301–313.
Stewart, A. 1983. "Stesichorus and the François Vase." In *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography*, ed. W. Moon, 53–74. Madison.
Suzuki, M. 1989. *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic*. Ithaca.
Taplin, O.P. 1992. *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad*. Oxford.
West, M.L. 1971. "Stesichorus." *CQ* 21: 302–314.
Wilson, P. 2009. "Thamyris the Thracian: the archetypal wandering poet?" In *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture. Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, ed. R. Hunter and I. Rutherford, 46–79. Cambridge.
Woodbury, L. 1967. "Helen and the Palinode." *Phoenix* 21: 157–176.

CHAPTER 10

On the Antagonism between Divine and Human Performer in Archaic Greek Poetics

Vayos Liapis

Synergy and Antagonism in Archaic Greek Poetics

It is a well-known tenet of archaic Greek poetics that the human performer—poet, musician, or *aoidos*—stands in a relationship of dependency with respect to a divine prototype performer, most often the Muses. The Muses, *qua* goddesses, are endowed with all-encompassing knowledge of the past, present, and future, and the human performer must depend upon them if he is to have access to true and detailed information about his subject.[1]

I will argue in this chapter that this is only part of the story. The human performer's relation to the Muses, or to other divine figures who may function as instigators of song, is an ambiguous one, and the blessings he receives from them are hardly ever unmixed. For as well as being subservient to the divine initiators of song, the human performer is also often perceived as their antagonist. The very act of performance constitutes an intrusion into their domain and a usurpation of their status as arch-performers; the more skilled the human performer, the greater his potential transgression. Consequently, as well as granting him the gift of song, the poet's divine patrons often verbally or physically attack him, and may even go as far as to maim him. All in all, I intend to show that the relationship between human performer and divine patron (or prototype performer, or arch-performer) is fundamentally and irreducibly ambiguous and even contradictory: it involves both synergy between human and divine performer under the latter's benign patronage[2] and fierce antagonism that may result in the human performer's incapacitation (poetic or even physical).

1 E.g., *Il.* 2. 484–486, *Od.* 8. 62–64, 479–481, 488–489, and 22. 344–349; Hes. *Th.* 22–34, 94–95; *Op.* 658–662. See further, Collins (1999) 242; Dodds (1951) 80–82, 100 nn. 116–117, 101 n. 121; West on Hes. *Th.* 32; Clay (1997) 9–25.

2 Poets are often thought of as being under the Muses' patronage from a very young age (cf. Call. fr. 1.37–38 Pfeiffer); they are singled out at an early stage as future poets, often by an omen (Stesichorus in Plin. *NH* 10.82), and are often miraculously protected against danger (Pindar in Paus. 9.23.2; cf. Hor. *C.* 3.4.9–20).

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_012

As a consequence, concepts of authorship and authority need to be viewed in light of this antinomic relationship. On the one hand, the human performer may invoke the authority of the Muses (or another divine song-maker) and consequently underplay his own authorial role, thereby implicitly bolstering the authenticity of his poetic voice. On the other hand, he may challenge divine authority by setting up his authorial persona as a rival of the divine arch-performer. The result is a complex, even apparently paradoxical poetics, whereby conflicting identities can coexist in a sort of symbiotic tension, so that the human performer is at the same time dependent on and in rivalry with the divinities of song.

Traces of this paradoxical relationship are detectable already in the *loci classici* (cited in n. 1) that are generally regarded as evidence for the divine patronage of human performers. Thus, Demodocus is "dearly loved by the Muse" (*Odyssey* 8.63 τὸν περὶ Μοῦσ' ἐφίλησε),[3] who has given him the gift of "sweet song" (*Od.* 8.64 δίδου δ' ἡδεῖαν ἀοιδήν); at the same time, however, he is also the Muse's victim, for she has made him blind. Intriguingly, according to a scholion on the ps.-Ovidian *Ibis* (272), Demodocus was blinded after being defeated at a contest with the Muses. Whether this represents genuine tradition or is modelled on the Thamyris story (see 2.1 below), it makes explicit the often latent motif of the antagonism between human and divine performer.[4] In comparable fashion, Hesiod's *Dichterweihe* (*Th.* 22–34) culminates in the poet's being awarded a laurel staff as a symbol of his newly acquired status as *aoidos*[5]—but not before he is submitted to intense verbal abuse by the Muses: ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον, "shepherds dwelling in the fields, vile disgraces, nothing but bellies" (*Th.* 26).[6] In an ingenious fresh interpretation of this passage, Katz and Volk (2000) have argued that the Muses' reproach may also be read positively, as a statement of poetics. Apart from its obvious mean-

---

3 For the Muse's "love" of singers cf. *Od.* 8.479–481: πᾶσι γὰρ ἀνθρώποισιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀοιδοί | τιμῆς ἔμμοροί εἰσι καὶ αἰδοῦς, οὕνεκ' ἄρα σφέας | οἴμας Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε, φίλησε δὲ φῦλον ἀοιδῶν, "among all people who live on earth singers are honoured and respected; for they have been taught the path of song by the Muse, who loves the race of singers." See also Hes. *Th.* 94–97; Pi. fr. 155 S.-M.; Theocr. 1.141; 5.80–81; 7.95; 11.6; *Epigr.* 21.4.

4 The *Ibis* scholion is mentioned by Buxton (1980) 27; cf. Wilson (2009) 50 n. 11. For the mythological connexion between blindness and poetry, and for the cultural logic underlying it, see again Buxton (1980) 27–28, 29–32.

5 Further on the significance of the Muses' gifts, see Stoddard (2003).

6 Epimenides 3 B 1 Diels-Kranz (Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί) *may* have been addressed to him by one of the divine figures he encountered in his sleep in the grotto of Dictaean Zeus. But our sources are too vague to allow any certainty in this matter.

ing ("gluttons"), γαστέρες οἶον may also allude to the notion that the belly can function as a receptacle for privileged (prophetic, poetic) knowledge, and that it is even capable of issuing intelligent speech. In other words, by suggesting that the poet-to-be is "a mere belly" waiting to be filled with the divine voice of the Muses,[7] the goddesses simultaneously reproach the initiate *and* point out his poetic receptiveness. To Katz and Volk's argumentation it should be added that the belly, especially the liver, is considered the seat of mantic visions in Plato (*Tim.* 70d–72b).[8]

The notion of an antagonistic relationship between human performer and divine patron may help us shed new light on a famous passage, which is standardly referred to in discussions of archaic poetics. This is *Odyssey* 22.347–348, where Phemius states: αὐτοδίδακτος δ' εἰμί, θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσὶν οἴμας | παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν, "I am self-taught: a god planted in my breast all sorts of paths of song." In a sensitive exploration of this and other passages, Katz and Volk (2000) 128 conclude that the epic poet "is ambivalent as to whether the poet is an independent artist or a medium of the Muses—or, rather, that poetry, like so many other human activities, is subject to the so-called 'dual motivation', that is to say, is presented as caused by both humans and gods at the same time." The notion of "dual motivation" implies a synergy between gods and humans working towards a joint purpose; the poet is dependent on the Muses as initiators of his song, but he also takes an active part in the making of the song.[9] However, I should rather opt for the more aggressive term "antagonism," which I think better sets out the dynamics of the relationship between god and human performer and helps explain, *inter alia*, why the relationship, albeit synergistic in principle, sometimes turns sour, as we shall see immediately below. If Phemius, the archetypical *aoidos*, gives pride of place

7 I add that a comparable idea may lurk in Theocr. 7.37–38 καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Μοισᾶν καπυρὸν στόμα, κἠμὲ λέγοντι | πάντες ἀοιδὸν ἄριστον: even the best of *aoidoi* is no more than the Muses' "piercing mouth," or mouthpiece. Cf. also Theocr. 10.24–25.

8 Cf. esp. 71d τὴν περὶ τὸ ἧπαρ ψυχῆς μοῖραν κατῳκισμένην … μαντείᾳ χρωμένην καθ' ὕπνον, "the part of the soul that is situated around the liver … and turns oracular during sleep"; 71e κατέστησαν ἐν τούτῳ τὸ μαντεῖον, "(the makers of the human race) situated the oracle in the liver." Cf. Sorensen (2002) 94 with n. 100.

9 On "dual motivation" in Homeric poetics, see Murray (1981) 96–97 with earlier bibliography and further discussion; cf. also Segal (1994) 138–139 on the archaic *aoidos* viewing "his art as coming *both* from his own power and from a god" (quotation from p. 138). *Contra* Ford (1992) 34, who takes the two clauses of Phemius' statement to be essentially synonymous: "an inspired poet gets his song from the Muses [i.e. he does not make it up] and so is self-taught in the sense that he gets them from no one else." This gives primacy to the Muses and accordingly downplays the poet's individual craft.

to his own skill (αὐτοδίδακτός εἰμι), while at the same time acknowledging, in seemingly self-contradictory fashion, the crucial role played by the god who "implants" songs in his breast, it is because he chooses not to underplay the ambiguous, dynamic, and even confrontational aspect of the relationship. Although fully cognizant of the god's indispensable gift of song, and thus of his ultimate authority over song-performance, Phemius at the same time foregrounds his own authorial voice by attributing his mastery of song to his own poetic skills.

Human and Divine Performers: Competition, Catastrophe, and Consecration

The Muses against Thamyris

An extreme example of the antagonistic relation between human and divine performer is Thamyris, the Thracian singer who presumptuously challenged the Muses to a singing contest but was defeated and punished with loss of sight and of his ability to sing.[10] The essentials of the Thamyris myth are given in *Iliad* 2.594–600: Thamyris "boasted that he should be the winner even if the Muses themselves were to sing"; the angered Muses accepted the challenge, and when Thamyris, predictably, lost at the ensuing contest the Muses maimed him (599 πηρὸν θέσαν),[11] deprived him of his divine song (599–600 ἀοιδὴν | θεσπεσίην ἀφέλοντο), and made him forget how to play the cithara (600 ἐκλέλαθον κιθαριστύν). In Hesiod (fr. 65 M.-W. = 66 Most) Thamyris' handicap is specifically loss of eyesight,[12] and this is also the version put forth in [Euripides'] *Rhesus* 921–925:

10 For a detailed discussion of Thamyris, see Wilson (2009) 47, who interprets this mythical figure as an emblem "for a religious tradition that ran against the current of the mainstream Olympian religion of the *Iliad* as well as for a mode of poetic performance that challenged that of Homeric epic itself."

11 The phraseology does not make it clear whether Thamyris' handicap was blindness; cf. Brillante (1991) 431–432.

12 Ὦρος ἐν τοῖς Ἐθνικοῖς τάδε γράφει· "καὶ τὰ περὶ Θάμυριν ἐν Δωρίῳ παριστοροῦντος τοῦ ποιητοῦ (*Il.* 2.594), πάλιν Ἡσίοδος 'Δωτίῳ ἐν πεδίῳ' φάσκει αὐτὸν τετυφλῶσθαι", "Oros writes [...] as follows in his *Ethnica*: 'and while the poet (i.e. Homer) incidentally locates the story of Thamyris in Dorion, Hesiod instead says that he was blinded in the Dotian plain'" (tr. G.W. Most). On the localization of Dorion/Dotion (Thessaly or Peloponnese?) see Brillante (1991) 429–431; Wilson (2009) 48–50, 52–54.

ὅτ’ ἤλθομεν γῆς χρυσόβωλον ἐς λέπας
Πάγγαιον ὀργάνοισιν ἐξησκημέναι
Μοῦσαι μεγίστην εἰς ἔριν μελῳδίας
κλεινῷ σοφιστῇ Θρῃκὶ κἀτυφλώσαμεν
Θάμυριν, ὃς ἡμῶν πόλλ’ ἐδέννασεν τέχνην

… when us Muses, all equipped with our musical instruments, went to Mt. Pangaeum, that gold-clodded prominence, there to hold a supreme contest of music against the renowned Thracian singer, Thamyris, and blinded him, for he oftentimes reviled our art.

Later versions of the myth add that Thamyris had hoped to lie with all nine Muses as a prize for his victory.[13] For his insolence he received due punishment in Hades (*Minyas* fr. 3–4 Bernabé, West ~ fr. 4 Davies), and the scene was famously depicted in Polygnotus’ painting in the Cnidian *Leskhē* at Delphi (Paus. 10.30.8), where Thamyris was shown as a dejected, haggard figure, his disjointed lyre lying at his feet, presumably as a symbol for the loss of his musical skills. Intriguingly, Pausanias (9.30.2) saw a statue of the defeated Thamyris with similar features (blindness, broken lyre) on Helicon, the very seat of the offended Muses.[14] Indeed, a base from a statue of Thamyris found at, precisely, the Heliconian sanctuary bears an epigram by Honestus, which emphasizes the symbiotic coexistence of the defeated singer with his punishers in the latter’s cultic space:

[Τ]ὸν θρασὺν ἐς μολπὴν ἄφθογγον νῦν μετ’ ἀοιδὴν
  λεῦσσε· τί γὰρ Μούσαις εἰς ἔριν ἠντίασα;
[π]ηρὸς δ’ ὁ Θρῄϊξ Θαμύρας φό[ρ]μιγγι παρῖμαι,
  ἀλλά, θεαί, μολπῆς γ’ ὑμετέρης ἀΐω.

Look at me, formerly overconfident in my singing but now voiceless after the song(-contest): why did I encounter the Muses to hold a contest

13 Asclep. Tragil., *FGrHist* 12 F 10; Apollod. 1.3.3; schol. A *Il.* 2.595 (I 311 Erbse); see further Brillante (1991) 447–448, who points out the reversal of roles implied by Thamyris’ hubristic ambition (it is normally the Muses that “love” human singers, see n. 3 above). On the Thamyris myth cf. also Rempe (1927) 35–38 and see further Liapis (2012) *ad* [E.] *Rh.* 912–915, 915–916.

14 Wilson (2009) 54–55 further identifies possible relics of an ancient association between Thamyris and the Underworld, and (more importantly for our case) of a rivalry between Thamyris and Apollo in terms of their respective song-making skills.

> with them? Here I lie a crippled man, Thamyris the Thracian, with my phorminx. But, goddesses (= Muses), I can still hear your song.[15]

The etymology of Thamyris' name may lead to interesting conclusions. Θάμυρις is in all likelihood related to θαμά "often" and θαμέες "frequent, crowded": Hesychius (θ 90–91 Latte) glosses θάμυρις by πανήγυρις, σύνοδος, and θαμυρίζει by ἀθροίζει, συνάγει.[16] Moreover, epigraphic evidence suggests that θαμυρίζειν was the technical term for a religious office at a festival gathering in Thespiae:

> Μενάνδρω ἰ̣ε̣[ρ]αρχίοντος,
> θαμυριδδόντω̣ν̣
> Πισάνδρω
> Δαμοκλεῖος
>
> With Menander as high priest; with Pisander and Damocles as *thamyrizontes* ("celebrants of the Thamyris cult"? Or "assemblers"?)[17]

On the basis of this evidence, one is tempted to speculate that Θάμυρις the mythic singer may be a personification, an embodiment, or a *fictionalized projection* of gatherings at which musical performances must have featured prominently. To quote Wilson (2009) 50–51:

> "Thamyris' […] looks like an ancient Aeolic name for a special form of communal gathering, for supra-local meetings at a religious centre. The Thracian's mythic identity must somehow be founded on this idea, as the embodiment or instigator of such unions, probably as 'the one who brings people into a group *through song*'" (Wilson's emphasis).

---

15 *SEG* 15 (1958) 320(b) 1–4. The statue is the work of Kaphisias, dedicated by a certain Philetaerus of Pergamum, son of Eumenes, to the Muses. The epigram by Honestus is a later addition (ca. 1st c. BC / AD 1st c.).

16 Morphologically, θάμ-υρις seems parallel to ἄγ-υρις, πανήγ-υρις, for which see Schwyzer (1938) 351; Lejeune (1955) 107 with n. 3, 169 n. 2.

17 For the inscription see Plassart (1926) 401–403 no. 18.2 (with discussion); *SEG* 32 (1982) 503. Cf. Roesch (1982) 138–142 who interprets θαμυριδδόντων as "célébrer le culte de Thamyris"; by contrast, Brillante (1991) 444–445 sees here a reflection of Thamyris' status as presiding over boys' choruses at Thespiae. See also Clay (2004) 153 and esp. Wilson (2009) 51 with n. 17.

This notion is not entirely without parallels: it has been suggested that Ὅμηρος may ultimately derive from *ὅμᾱρος or *ὅμᾱρις, "assembly of the people in which poetic performances were held" (cf. Sanskrit *sam-aryám*, "festival gathering").[18] We may also consider the name of Thespis, which is usually associated with θέσπις, "speaking like a god," an epithet qualifying both singers and songs in epic.[19] It has been argued that Θέσπις may have expressed the dependence of early tragedy on the tradition of epic performance,[20] but Hesychius (θ 394 Latte) intriguingly glosses θέσπιδες as θυσίαι, θεοσέβειαι, which entitles us at least to entertain the possibility that "Thespis" was originally a fictionalized embodiment or projection of the "sacrifices" or "festivals" at which tragedy was performed.

We seem to be facing an interesting complex of apparently paradoxical ritual and mythic notions, which are, I submit, an essential part of archaic Greek poetics, as well as of archaic Greek religious thought. Thamyris antagonizes the Muses, is blinded by them, but his statue is nonetheless set up next to theirs in their very own grove on Helikon, thereby establishing a conspicuous proximity—and thus an implied cultic symbiosis—between the rivals. What is more, the human festival held there may well have been called θάμυρις, and its officiants θαμυρίζοντες (cf. θαμυριδδόντων in the Thespiae inscription), thereby evoking the legendary Thamyris and his fatal rivalry with the Muses presiding in the sanctuary. The human performers of song participating in such gatherings were conceivably susceptible of antagonizing the Muses, insofar as their poetic skill could be perceived as laying a claim to artistic parity with the Muses. The symbiotic tension obtaining between human performers and the Muses in the context of the Heliconian festival (the human θάμυρις) intensifies dramatically, at the level of myth, into a disastrous hostility between Thamyris and the Muses.

The position of the Thamyris story in the *Iliad* is highly significant: "it should be related in part to its proximity to the great re-invocation of the Muses with which the 'Catalogue of Ships' begins, just a hundred lines earlier."[21] In

---

18 So West (1999) 375–376, expanding on an earlier suggestion by Durante (1976) 185–204, who had pointed to Ὁμάριον, the sacred grove where the Achaean Confederacy held its assemblies under the patronage of Zeus Ὁμάριος. For a different interpretation of Ὅμηρος as "he who joins together" (ὁμο- + root ἀρ-), see Nagy (1999) 297–300 and (1996) 90.

19 *Od.* 17.385 θέσπιν ἀοιδόν; 1.328, 8.498 θέσπιν ἀοιδήν. Cf. Else (1957) 20 n. 3. See also n. 20 below. For the translation "speaking like a god," see Ford (1992) 32.

20 Thus Else (1967) 51–52.

21 Quotation from Wilson (2009) 57.

the "second proem" of the *Iliad* the poet displays a conspicuously deferential attitude to the Muses not merely by asking them to preside over his song-making (2.484 "come now near me, Muses, you who inhabit the Olympian mansions …") but principally by acknowledging his own complete dependence on the goddesses' guidance and inspiration (*Il.* 2.485–492):

ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστέ τε ἴστέ τε πάντα,
ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν·
οἵ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν·
πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἶεν,
φωνὴ δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη,
εἰ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
θυγατέρες μνησαίαθ' ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον

For you are goddesses and omnipresent and know all things, whereas we hear only rumours and know nothing. As to who the leaders and commanders of the Danaans were, their multitude I would never be able to recount or to name, even if I had ten tongues and ten mouths, and an unbroken voice and a heart of bronze, unless the Olympian Muses, daughters of Zeus the aegis-wielder, called to mind those who came to Ilion …

The proximity of the Thamyris story to this markedly respectful address to the Muses should speak for itself: the poet of the *Iliad* takes pains to distance his own Muse-inspired art from the self-destructive presumption of Thamyris, who is thereby reduced to a counter-example to be avoided. As Ford (1992) 97 remarks, "Thamyris, the only named and identified singer in the *Iliad*, stands in that poem for preceding poets, and his contest shows that mere temporal earliness is not enough to guarantee a strong transmission of song if the Muses are not honored." Indeed, as is further argued by Wilson (2009) 52, 57, Thamyris may represent an alternative performance tradition that rivalled Homeric song-making—perhaps a more fully musical tradition (Thamyris, after all, is a *kitharōidos*) set against hexameter epic.[22]

However this may be, the crucial aspect of the Thamyris story for our discussion remains its potential as a warning tale: an *aoidos*' excellence is susceptible of being perceived as a challenge to the divine agents of song. By claiming to

22 See also Carruesco's contribution to this volume (Ch. 9).

be able to defeat even the Muses themselves in song, Thamyris expresses in extreme form the antagonistic ideology that underlies the poetics of archaic performance.[23] At the same time, Thamyris' statue at Thespiae, in the very grove of the Muses, and the existence of a local festival there, with officiants bearing the name of θαμυρίζοντες, are also an integral part of the Thamyris complex: the hubristic figure of the legend seems to have had a collective counterpart in historic reality, insofar as actual human celebrants gathered in a festal context to (presumably) perform songs and thus to re-enact Thamyris' challenge against the supreme song-makers, the Muses.[24]

A parallel to the symbiotic tension between Thamyris and the Muses may be found in the story of Linos, a legendary singer and indeed "inventor," according to Diodorus Siculus (3.67.1), "of rhythm and song." Apollo grew jealous of Linos and eventually slew him, because his extraordinary talent risked making him "equal to the god in terms of song" (ἐξισούμενον κατὰ τὴν ᾠδήν), as Pausanias (9.29.6) puts it. However, once destroyed by the song-making god, Linos acquired a prominent place in the grove of the Muses on Helikon, where (according, again, to Pausanias) his effigy stood next to the image of Eupheme, the nurse of the Muses. Indeed, this effigy was the recipient of offerings "each year before the sacrifice to the Muses" (Paus., *loc. cit.*); after all, according to an early genealogy (Hes. fr. 305 M.-W. = 255 Most), Linos was the son of the Muse Ourania. What is more, Linos, as well as being granted a place of honor among the Muses, was also immortalized in the form of λίνος, a type of threnetic song (cf. Pindar fr. 128c.6 S.-M.) reportedly widespread in the Eastern Mediterranean basin (Egypt, Phoenicia, Cyprus) and sung in Greek banquets and dances.[25]

---

23 Wilson (2009) 59 sees in Thamyris' claim to defeat anyone in song, even the Muses themselves, a *reductio ad absurdum* of the agonistic mind-set. I would rather argue that the *ant*agonistic mind-set—the awareness that poetic performance in and by itself may represent a challenge to the divinities of song-making—is already built into the poetics of archaic performance, and that the Thamyris story expresses, in the extreme form of mythical narrative, precisely this tension between human and divine performer.

24 Thamyris seems to have associations with the Muses (he is the son of a Nymph or a Muse, he is possessed of extraordinary vision) even before his final consecration at the Heliconian grove: see Brillante (1991) 433–437. Buxton (1980) 28 also invokes the parallel of the tragic poet Achaeus "who, it was said, lost his sight after being stung by bees." Since bees are traditionally associated with the Muses (see further Buxton *loc. cit.*), Achaeus' fate encapsulates the pattern whereby a poet is maimed by the very agency that is responsible for his inspiration.

25 Eastern Mediterranean: Hdt. 2.79; banquets and dances: Hes. fr. 305 M.-W. = 255 Most. On the Linos-song see Alexiou (2002) 57. Further on the Linos myth and on the related song traditions see Preller (1872) 377–380.

Once again, that is, the extraordinarily skilled human singer is annihilated by the divine performer, only to enter posthumously into a privileged symbiotic relation with the divinities of song. Contrary to what happens to Thamyris, however, Linos' annihilation does not result in the loss of his song: on the contrary, Linos' artistic survival is assured by his assimilation into the song *linos*.

Yet another example of the same nexus of ideas is also to be detected in the well-known tale of the cicadas in Plato's *Phaedrus* 259a–d. As they discourse at the banks of Ilissus, Socrates and Phaedrus find themselves enchanted by the cicadas' song and about to fall asleep. "We must resist the temptation to fall asleep," says in effect Socrates, "or the cicadas will rightly make fun of us, thinking we're slaves who have come here to take their afternoon nap. But if they see that we go on conversing and sailing past them without falling under their Siren-like spell, maybe they will accept, in admiration, to grant us the prerogatives (γέρας) they have been authorized by the gods to grant to humans" (259a–b). Following Phaedrus' ignorant question on the exact nature of these prerogatives, Socrates narrates an ostensibly popular tale (λέγεται). According to it, the cicadas were once men, who happened to have lived before the Muses were created. Once the Muses appeared, however, their delightful song amazed these men so much that they gave up all thought of eating and drinking: song was all they could care about, and they spent all their time singing. Thus they died of starvation, although in their death they somehow gave birth to the race of cicadas (ἐξ ὧν τὸ τεττίγων γένος μετ' ἐκεῖνο φύεται, 259c), which were granted by the Muses the prerogative of singing till the end of their days without ever being in need of food or drink. Moreover, when cicadas die they go "to the Muses" (παρὰ Μούσας) to report on which men give due honors to the Muses here on earth (e.g., they inform Terpsichore about those performing choral dances, thereby making them "dearer," προσφιλεστέρους, to her, etc.). It is clear that the story reproduces the familiar pattern: the human ancestors of the cicadas enjoy the special status of prototypical singers; their love of song (and presumably their excellence in it) leads to their death; however, after their death they—or rather their avatars, the cicadas—enjoy a privileged relation (γέρας) with the divine patrons of song, the Muses, to whom they act as special messengers.

A final manifestation of the pattern identified above is to be found in the tale of Aesop's death and subsequent consecration. The Delphians falsely accused the teller of tales *par excellence* of having stolen a golden cup from Apollo's sanctuary (in fact, the Delphians themselves had had the cup planted in Aesop's luggage). Apollo, who had reason to resent Aesop, favored the treacherous act—or, in one version of the story, actively assisted (συνεργοῦντος) the Del-

phians in paving the way for Aesop's eventual execution.[26] The Delphians condemn Aesop to be pushed off a cliff; the latter takes refuge temporarily at the sanctuary of the Muses (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῶν Μουσῶν) or of Apollo (ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος) but is dragged away from it.[27] Just before his death, Aesop curses the Delphians and invokes "the leader of the Muses" (τὸν προστάτην τῶν Μουσῶν), viz. Apollo, to witness his unjust demise. Subsequently, the Delphians are instructed by an oracle to "atone for" (ἐξιλάσκεσθαι) the death of Aesop.[28] Indeed, in version W of the *Life of Aesop*, the Delphians, having been afflicted by pestilence, constructed a temple and erected a *stēlē* in honor of Aesop.[29] That this amounts to hero cult is made explicit in a papyrus fragment (P. Oxy. 1800 = *testim.* 25, Perry (1952) 221) preserving a variant version of Aesop's death: here, the Delphians rid themselves of the pestilence resulting from Aesop's unjust execution by setting up an altar (βωμόν) and sacrificing to him "as a hero" (ὡς ἥρῳ) at Delphi.[30] In other words, as Nagy (1999) 302 points out, Apollo's maleficence against Aesop (his wrath, which leads eventually to the latter's death) coexists with and is complemented by a beneficent aspect, whereby the god—to whom, we recall, Aesop appeals as "the leader of the Muses" and to whose sanctuary he takes refuge (in *Vita* W) before his death—arranges for his human victim to receive posthumous honors at the god's Delphic sanctuary in the form of hero cult.[31] "In such a hero cult," Nagy (1999) 307 continues, "god and hero are to be institutionalized as the respectively dominant and recessive members of an eternal symbiotic relationship."[32]

26 See *Vita Aesopi* G + W 127–128 (Perry (1952) 74, 105). The detail about Apollo's active complicity is found in the Golenishchev Papyrus: see Perry (1952) 11; cf. Nagy (1999) 289, who offers the important qualification that "The pattern of antipathy between Aesop and Apollo is in fact complemented by a pattern of sympathy between him and the Muses"; cf. on this point Compton (2006) 23. However, as Nagy (1999) 290 also points out, "Aesop's essence as poet is defined not only by the Muses but also by their leader, Apollo himself."

27 See *Vita Aesopi* G 134 (Perry (1952) 76); *Vit. Aes.* W 134 (Perry (1952) 106). Cf. Compton (2006) 28.

28 *Vit. Aes.* G 142 (Perry (1952) 77).

29 *Vit. Aes.* W 142 (Perry (1952) 107).

30 See further Nagy (1999) 284–286.

31 Cf. also Compton (2006) 29–31.

32 Apollo's enmity against Aesop is explicitly compared to the god's enmity against Marsyas (*Vit. Aes.* G. 100 = Perry (1952) 66); cf. Compton (2006) 23, 29. Having fallen victim to the god's wrath as a result of a musical contest he failed to win, the satyr Marsyas seems to have received cultic honours, while his pipes eventually became the property of Apollo: see Compton (2006) 166–168.

Festival and Performance: Challenging the Divinities of Song

A central hypothesis this chapter advances is that, in the ideology of archaic poetics, each and every performance, and each and every communal gathering in which songs are performed, constitute *ipso facto* a challenge to the divine agents of song, in particular the Muses (as in the paradigmatic case of Thamyris) or Apollo (as in the paradigmatic cases of Linos and Aesop).[33] This idea is suggested already by a couple of passages in the Homeric Hymns, which refer to the songs' performance context. The first is from the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (151–152):

> φαίη κ' ἀθανάτους καὶ ἀγήρως ἔμμεναι αἰεὶ
> ὃς τότ' ἐπαντιάσει' ὅτ' Ἰάονες ἀθρόοι εἶεν·
>
> You would surely think that they are immortal and ageless forever, if you should ever happen to come across the Ionians, when they gather (for the Delian festival).

"Immortal and ageless forever" is of course a standard attribute of the gods (e.g., *Od.* 5.218), one which mere mortals can only daydream about (e.g., *Il.* 8.538–541, 12.323). Here, however, "immortal and ageless" is a term of praise and admiration rather than of unrealizable fantasy; it describes the Ionians in a way that seems perfectly earnest (if hyperbolical). It is significant that this exceptional instance of "immortal and ageless," whereby the Ionians are likened to gods, occurs in the very specific context of a religious festival involving religious songs (like the *Hymn to Apollo* itself). It is in precisely such a context that, if my analysis so far has been correct, the antagonism between human performers and divine patrons of song would have been most acutely experienced by participants.

A second passage that seems compatible with the reading offered here is to be found in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (76–80; 286–288):

> 76 τὸν δ' εὗρε σταθμοῖσι λελειμμένον οἶον ἀπ' ἄλλων
> Ἀγχίσην ἥρωα [...]
> [...] ὁ δὲ σταθμοῖσι λελειμμένος οἶος ἀπ' ἄλλων
> 80 πωλεῖτ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα διαπρύσιον κιθαρίζων.

33 Brillante (1991) 433 remarks that extraordinary mythic singers, such as Orpheus and Musaeus, "ragiunsero una tale conoscenza di quest'arte [i.e. μουσική] da provocare un temporaneo dissolvimento dei limiti che separano il mondo umano da quello divino."

286 » εἰ δέ κεν ἐξείπῃς καὶ ἐπεύξεαι ἄφρονι θυμῷ
» ἐν φιλότητι μιγῆναι ἐϋστεφάνῳ Κυθερείῃ,
» Ζεύς σε χολωσάμενος βαλέει ψολόεντι κεραυνῷ.

> And she [= Aphrodite] found him, hero Anchises, left all alone in his farmstead […] And he, left all alone in his farmstead, walked to and fro, playing his cithara loud and clear.
>
> (Aphrodite to Anchises) "And if you ever let out and boast foolishly that you have had amorous intercourse with Cytherea of the fair crown, Zeus in his anger will strike you down with a smoky thunderbolt."

Some contextualization is in order. In the former passage, Anchises, in the context of his first encounter with Aphrodite, is clearly presented as a *kithara* player and perhaps also as an *aoidos*.[34] In the latter passage, when his dalliance with the goddess is consummated, Anchises is threatened by Aphrodite with the direst punishment (a thunderbolt from Zeus) if he so much as hints at his affair with her. Indeed, it appears that in certain versions of the myth Anchises did divulge the details of that liaison and was subsequently punished with blindness, just as Thamyris was.[35] This nexus of ideas must have forced the original audience to consider the possibility that the *human* performer singing the Hymn to them may have actually been disobeying *ipso facto* Aphrodite's command, since to sing the Hymn is to make explicit the details of the goddess' amour with Anchises.

The two passages from the Homeric Hymns briefly discussed above contain elements that seem potentially to undermine or even to negate the Hymns' performance. The *Hymn to Aphrodite* explicitly incorporates into its narrative a stern warning by the goddess, to the effect that the Hymn's subject-matter is taboo; on the other hand, however, the existence and performance of the Hymn itself is *ipso facto* proof that the divine prohibition has been violated. Similarly, the *Hymn to Apollo* evokes as its performance context a religious festival in which the human participants come dangerously close to being assimilated to

34 Faulkner (2008) 160 (on *h.Aphr.* 80) remarks that πωλεῖτ', used of Anchises wandering to and fro while playing the cithara, is also used of the wandering bard (Homer) in *h.Apoll* 170. Cf. also Achilles playing the lyre in *Il.* 9.186.

35 On Zeus' punishment of Anchises in the Epic Cycle and in later authors see Faulkner (2008) 136 (on *h.Aphr.* 53–199) and 296 (on *h.Aphr.* 286–288); cf. also Brillante (1991) 451–452. For a Theocritean poem on the subject see Serv. *ad* Verg. *A.* 2.35, 687 (I, 221, 319 Thilo); cf. Buxton (1980) 31 n. 47.

the divine honorands, and so to provoking divine resentment and nullifying the Hymn's function as a religious hymn. At the same time, of course, performing at a festival in honor of the gods is pleasant to them and increases their favor for the mortals who so honor them. We saw above that in Plato's cicada fable those who perform choral dances are said to be "dearer" to Terpsichore, and the same author elsewhere (*Laws* 653d–654a) states that the Muses and Apollo join their human celebrants in their festivals (συνεορταστάς) and, indeed, in their choral dances (συγχορευτάς) in honor of the gods, so much so that they are said to be "leaders of the dance" for us humans (χορηγεῖν ἡμῶν τούτους). The paradox is an irreducible one: performance of song can be both a privileged means of pleasing the gods and a challenge to the artistic supremacy of the divine arch-performers. Both possibilities are inherent in performance and both may be actualized.

The tension between a song's actual performance by the human singer and its potential negation by the divine antagonist evokes the pernicious duality of yet another Muse-like group of mythical singers: the Sirens. As has often been pointed out, the Sirens share a number of common features with the Muses.[36] They are divine females, masters of song, possessed of supernatural knowledge: in fact, they know "anything that happens" in the world (ἴδμεν δ' ὅσσα γένηται, *Od.* 12.191), just as the Muses "know all things" (ἴστε τε πάντα, *Il.* 2.485). More specifically, the Sirens claim to be masters of the subject of *epic* song: they know "all the toils that the Argives and the Trojans suffered" at Troy (*Od.* 12.189–190), just as a Muse-inspired *aoidos* knows "everything that the Greeks did or suffered" at Troy (*Od.* 8.488–490).[37] As a matter of fact, the Sirens' song has intriguing resemblances to the song of the epic bard: the Sirens are "divinely sweet," θεσπεσιάων, which evokes θεσπέσιος, "talking like a god," a standard epithet of the *aoidos* in epic (see n. 19 above). Moreover, their song offers "pleasure" (*Od.* 12.52 τερπόμενος, 12.188 τερψάμενος), which is precisely the effect that the song of a good *aoidos* is supposed to produce (cf. *Od.* 15. 390–484, esp. 393 τερπομένοισιν ἀκουέμεν, 399 τερπώμεθα). Their song casts a spell on its audience (*Od.* 12.40, 44 θέλγουσιν), just as Phemius' song is said to spellbind people (Od. 1.337–338 βροτῶν θελκτήρια … | τά τε κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί). However, the Sirens, contrary to the Muses, can obliterate human *kleos*, "fame," since they cause their victims to perish.[38] As Circe warns Odysseus (*Od.*

---

36 On parallelisms between the Sirens and the Muses (or the Muse-inspired *aoidoi*) see Pucci (1996) 196–198; Ford (1992) 83–84; esp. Segal (1994) 100 and Doherty (1995) 82–83.

37 On the Sirens' apparent mastery of epic diction (especially of the Iliadic poetic tradition) see Pucci (1996) and Schein (1995) 21.

38 The point is argued *in extenso* by Segal (1994) 102–106; cf. Doherty (1995) 84.

12.39–46), anyone who becomes enchanted by the Sirens' song would be sure never to return home (*Od.* 12.43 οἴκαδε νοστήσαντι), despite the fact that the lying Sirens—and here one is reminded of Hesiod's (occasionally) lying Muses (*Theog.* 27–28)—treacherously promise Odysseus a safe "return home," once he has "obtained pleasure and furthered his knowledge" (ὅ γε τερψάμενος νεῖται καὶ πλείονα εἰδώς, *Od.* 12.188). Were Odysseus to fall under their spell (cf. *Od.* 12.40, 44 θέλγουσιν),[39] he would ineluctably forego his *nostos*; and, of course, Odysseus not accomplishing his *nostos* would be tantamount to the *Odyssey*—the epic song about Odysseus' *nostos*—negating itself. To quote Doherty (1995) 85, "... in contrast to the Muses' song, which is said to coincide with epic narrative ("Sing, goddess, the wrath," "Tell me, Muse, of the man"), the Sirens' song is portrayed as threatening the *Odyssey* narrative and must be cut short by it."[40] The song of the *Odyssey* and the song of the Sirens are antagonistic to each other, although the former incorporates the latter, while the latter seeks to usurp the former's subject-matter.

Homer against the Boys: Riddles and the Muses

Homeric epic, especially the *Iliad*, is characteristically reticent about the antagonistic aspects of poetic performance, and it elides almost all trace of the competitive context in which epic performance must have been often set from early times.[41] It is intriguing that, in the biographical tradition, the antagonism between human and divine performer(s) comes to the fore in the guise of an implicit rivalry between Homer and *the Muses themselves*, who seem to be ultimately responsible for the poet's death. Given the *Iliad*'s negative reference to Thamyris' rivalry with the Muses, one may find the idea of an enmity between Homer and the Muses absurd. I suggest, however, that the biographical tradition has preserved here a recollection of the pervasive antagonism between human and divine performer, a notion which, as I have been arguing, is a fundamental tenet of archaic poetics.

According to the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, Homer in his peregrinations throughout Greece visited Delphi, where he took the opportunity to ask the oracle about his homeland. The oracle told the poet that his mother's homeland was the island of Ios, where indeed he was destined to be buried; "but beware

39 For θέλγειν denoting the effects of magic arts on the senses cf. *Od.* 10.326 οὔτι πιὼν τάδε φάρμακ' ἐθέλχθης; Schein (1995) 21 discusses the sexual semantics of the word.

40 Cf. also Pucci (1996) 196.

41 See on this point Ford (1992) 95–98, who further points out that the only overt Homeric allusion to poetic competition, the Thamyris story, "is muted to near inaudibility" (quotation from p. 97).

the young boys' riddle," added the Pythia.[42] The oracular prediction came to pass when Homer, in ripe old age, visited the island of Ios (*Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* 18; West 2003, 350–352):

> ὁ ποιητὴς εἰς Ἴον ἔπλευσε πρὸς Κρεώφυλον κἀκεῖ χρόνον διέτριβε πρεσβύτης ὢν ἤδη. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς θαλάσσης καθήμενος παίδων τινῶν ἀφ' ἁλείας ἐρχομένων ὥς φασι πυθόμενος (*Epigr.* 17)
>
> ἄνδρες ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίης θηρήτορες ἦ ῥ' ἔχομέν τι;
>
> εἰπόντων δὲ ἐκείνων
>
> ὅσσ' ἕλομεν λιπόμεσθα, ὅσ' οὐχ ἕλομεν φερόμεσθα,
>
> οὐ νοήσας τὸ λεχθὲν ἤρετο αὐτοὺς ὅ τι λέγοιεν. οἱ δέ φασιν ἐν ἁλείᾳ μὲν ἀγρεῦσαι μηδέν, ἐφθειρίσθαι δέ, καὶ τῶν φθειρῶν οὓς ἔλαβον καταλιπεῖν, οὓς δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβον ἐν τοῖς ἱματίοις φέρειν. ἀναμνησθεὶς δὲ τοῦ μαντείου ὅτι τὸ τέλος αὐτοῦ ἥκοι τοῦ βίου, ποιεῖ τὸ τοῦ τάφου αὐτοῦ ἐπίγραμμα.
>
> ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίης cod.: ἄγρης ἁλίης Koechly θηρήτορες: ἁλιήτορες Vita Scorialensis I, (West 2003, 442); Vita Scorialensis II (West 2003, 448)
>
> … the poet sailed to Ios to see Creophylus, and spent some time there; by now he was getting on in years. As he was sitting by the sea, they say he asked some boys who were returning from fishing, "O huntsmen from Arcadia, have we caught anything?" When they replied, "The ones we caught we left behind, the ones we missed we carry," he did not understand, and asked them what they meant. They explained that they had caught nothing on their fishing expedition, but they had de-loused themselves, and the lice they had caught they had left behind, but the ones they failed to catch they were still carrying in their clothes. Then he remembered the prophecy, that the end of his life had come, so he composed his own tomb inscription.
>
> tr. WEST 2003, 351–353[43]

42 *Certamen* 5 (West 2003, 324).

43 The episode is also narrated in a number of ancient "Lives" of Homer.

This is on the surface a funny little story, which unsurprisingly gave rise to anti-Homeric ridicule already in antiquity. One recalls in particular Heraclitus' famous jibe (fr. 21 Marcovich = 22 B 56 Diels-Kranz), to the effect that Homer, supposedly the wisest of all the Greeks, was tricked by a bunch of mere boys—whose intellectual powers, we are to understand, are normally inferior to those of a grown person, as Heraclitus himself says elsewhere.[44] But there seems to be more to this story than thinly veiled (and crude) anti-Homeric criticism.

Let us start from the question Homer addresses to the fisher-boys (*Certamen* 18, quoted above): "O huntsmen from Arcadia, have we caught anything?" In this context, "huntsmen from Arcadia" seems absurd; the setting is the island of Ios, quite a few hundred miles away from Arcadia, and the persons addressed are not hunters but fishers. Textual corruption has been suspected, and Koechly suggested emending ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίης into ἄγρης ἁλίης.[45] However, ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίης is also transmitted in several other *Lives* (see again the *app. crit.*), which suggests that it is an ancient reading, and that it cannot be casually emended away. Moreover, the two *Vitae Scorialenses* offer the variant ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίης ἁλιήτορες, which would render Koechly's emendation incongruous. I suggest that Homer's question to the fisher-boys, far from being textually corrupt, must be read as a riddle, one that it is deliberately phrased so as to sound absurd. Evidently, Homer plays with the two meanings of ἀπό, namely "coming from" and "away from."[46] Homer's question to the boys becomes perfectly meaningful if we interpret ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίης θηρήτορες as "hunters (or "fishermen," ἁλιήτορες) away from Arcadia." The point is that the boys are, indeed, "hunters," hunters of fish, but they are not to be associated with the place typically haunted by hunters, namely landlocked Arcadia. Now, the fisher-boys, undaunted by Homer's riddling question, respond with a riddle of their own, "capping" the old master's clever line with an even cleverer one; thus, they beat Homer at his own game.

Interestingly, an epigram by Alcaeus of Messene (late 3rd/early 2nd c. BC) unambiguously presents the boys that defeated Homer as agents of the Muses themselves (*Anth. Gr.* VII. 1 = XI, 62–69 Gow-Page):

44 See fr. 92 Marcovich = 22 B 79 D–K: "Man is called foolish by god, just as a child is by a grown man." Cf. Richardson (1981) 2. It is precisely such anti-Homeric ridicule that the author of the *Vita Herodotea* (36) seems to be contesting when he insists that Homer died because of an illness he had been suffering from rather than as a result of his failure to answer the boys' riddle.

45 See the *apparatus criticus* to *Certamen* 18 above, reproduced from West 2003.

46 For the latter sense cf., e.g., Thuc. 1. 7 ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ᾠκίσθησαν, "they settled away from the sea."

ἡρώων τὸν ἀοιδὸν Ἴῳ ἔνι παῖδες Ὅμηρον
ἤκαχον, ἐκ Μουσέων γρῖφον ὑφηνάμενοι,
νέκταρι δ' εἰνάλιαι Νηρηΐδες ἐχρίσαντο
καὶ νέκυν ἀκταίῃ θῆκαν ὑπὸ σπιλάδι
ὅττι Θέτιν κύδηνε καὶ υἱέα καὶ μόθον ἄλλων
ἡρώων Ἰθάκου τ' ἔργματα Λαρτιάδεω.
ὀλβίστη νήσων πόντῳ Ἴος ὅττι κέκευθε
βαιὴ Μουσάων ἀστέρα καὶ Χαρίτων.

In Ios the boys, *weaving a riddle at the bidding of the Muses, vexed to death Homer* the singer of the heroes. And the Nereids of the sea anointed him with nectar and laid him dead under the rock on the shore; because he glorified Thetis and her son and the battle-din of the other heroes and the deeds of Odysseus of Ithaca. Blessed among the islands in the sea is Ios, for small though she be, she covers the star of the Muses and Graces.[47]

tr. PATON 1919, 3 (emphasis mine)

The repetition of Μουσέων (2) and Μουσάων (8) has led some philologists to suspect textual corruption, and Reiske emended Μουσέων (2) into Μοιρέων—the idea being, presumably, that the Fates (Μοῖραι) arranged for the old oracle given to Homer ("beware the young boys' riddle") to come to pass.[48] However, Μουσέων γρῖφον seems appropriate in light of the early association between the Muses and riddling discourse. Already in the proem of Hesiod's *Theogony* (27–28) the goddesses famously make a puzzling statement: "we know how to tell many lies resembling the truth; but we also know how to sing the truth loud and clear, when we want to." This is an unfalsifiable claim: not only is it impossible to establish whether the Muses are being truthful or not at any given moment; it is also impossible to ascertain whether there is even any truth to the Muses' claim that they can be truthful at least sometimes.[49]

---

47 On the story of Homer's death, see also Compton (2006) 73–74.

48 See Gow and Page (1965) 17.

49 The quandary is of course reminiscent of the "Epimenides paradox" (cf. n. 6 above), as well as of a number of statements in archaic Greek poetry to which no specific truth-value can be assigned. Cf., e.g., *Od.* 19.560–567: dreams come to humans from two different gates, one of them producing true dreams, the other false ones; it is impossible to know which gate any given dream comes from. Likewise, in *h.Herm.* 552–563 the Thriae prophesise truthfully only if they eat honey, otherwise they lie; there is no means of establishing whether they have partaken of "the sweet food of gods" (562) or not. Cf. further Detienne (1996) 12–13, 23–24. Recently, Heiden (2007) propounded a somewhat different interpretation, according to which Hesiod's Muses, rather than claiming to be now lying now telling the

In light of the above, the repetition of Μουσάων in line 8 of Alcaeus' epigram seems to be intentional: Homer may have died as a result of the Muses' collusion with the boys (l. 2), but after his death he became "the star of the Muses," which is to say, evidently, that he is highly honoured by the Muses. Indeed, this dual relationship between poet and divine patron is consistent with the semantics of the word θεράπων, which describes the archaic poet's status in relation to the Muses in Hesiod's *Theogony* 99–100: ἀοιδὸς | Μουσάων θεράπων. As argued by Nagy (1999) 292–297, in the wake of Van Brock's study of comparative material,[50] θεράπων, conventionally translated as "warrior's companion" or "attendant," designates a more complex status, namely that of a god's "double" or "ritual substitute." The god's θεράπων is both equated with the god and eventually destroyed by him; the experience of death is essential to the *therapōn*'s being transformed, posthumously, into a hero of cult. Indeed, as a hero of cult the dead person enters a symbiotic relationship with the divinity who was responsible for his/her death in the first place. To quote Burkert (1985) 202–203:

> In myth [...] the gods often have a mortal double who could almost be mistaken for the god except for the fact that he is subject to death, and indeed is killed by the god himself: Hyakinthos appears with Apollo, Iphigeneia with Artemis, Erectheus with Poseidon and Iodama with Athena. [...] Myth has separated into two figures what in the sacrificial ritual is present as a tension.[51]

This is the sort of status achieved by Homer too: driven to death by means of a riddle inspired by the Muses, he posthumously achieves honor and distinction on the part of the very divinities that were responsible for his death. In particular, the image of the dead Homer as a *star* not only carries connotations of

---

truth, disavow the very distinction between truths and lies, and claim some of the truth's authority for poetic tales; whether they are true or not is irrelevant.

50 Van Brock (1959), esp. 119. On θεράπων = "ritual substitute" see also Nagy (1990a) 48, 129–130, 135 n. 58; (1990b) 211–212; Lowenstam (1981) 126–131, 174–177; Freiert (1991) 42; Collins (1999) 242 n. 6; Dué (2002) 76. On the poet as θεράπων of the Muses see also Murray (1981) 97 with n. 65.

51 For the cultic symbiosis of a god's human "double" with his or her divine counterpart and destroyer, cf. also the Megarian cult of Ἀθηνᾶ Αἰαντίς (Paus. 1.42.4), in which Ajax apparently coexists with his destroyer, Athena (although Pausanias' own rationalistic explanation of the title was that Athena's temple was named after Ajax because he had dedicated the statue of the goddess). Likewise, the Thracian king Lycurgus, enemy and persecutor of Dionysus, was destroyed by the god but seems to have been somehow amalgamated with him posthumously in ritual: see West (1983) 64 with n. 6.

beauty, splendor and triumphant victory, but also evokes the popular idea that people become stars after their *death*.[52]

Riddling Competitions: Woe from Wit

The story of Homer's defeat by the boys in what appears to be a riddle contest evokes a recurrent story motif in which, as West (2007) 74 puts it, "the loser in a contest of wisdom does not merely suffer chagrin but forfeits his life"; as West shows, the motif seems to have Indo-European ancestry. Another well-known instance of this narrative pattern in the Greek tradition is the story of the contest between the seers Mopsus and Tiresias, narrated in the Hesiodic *Melampodia* (fr. 278 Merkelbach-West = 214 Most). The contest, which took place near the oracular site of Claros, involved Calchas posing questions and conundrums to Mopsus, who proved able to solve all of them; as a result Calchas died of grief, since he could not outwit his rival seer.

An even better known instance of the motif is the Sphinx episode in the Oedipus legend: those who failed to solve the monster's riddle were killed, but as soon as Oedipus provided the correct answer the Sphinx was doomed. Interestingly, in *Oedipus Tyrannus* the confrontation between Oedipus and the Sphinx is framed in terms reminiscent of *song* performance: the Sphinx is explicitly called σκληρὰ ἀοιδός, "harsh singer," and ποικιλῳδός, "singer of perplexing songs" (OT 36, 130); for the image cf. also Euripides' *Phoenissae* 1506–1507 δυσξύνετον ξυνετὸς μέλος ἔγνω | Σφιγγὸς ἀοιδοῦ σῶμα φονεύσας, "with his intelligence he made sense of the hardly intelligible song, and killed Sphinx the singer." More strikingly still, in Euripides' *Phoenissae* (49–50) the riddle is boldly termed "the Sphinx's Muses": τυγχάνει δέ πως | μούσας ἐμὸς παῖς Οἰδίπους Σφιγγὸς μαθών, "by some chance my son Oedipus happened to understand the Sphinx's Muses." Indeed, in the *Phoenissae* the Sphinx is repeatedly associated (most often negatively) with the Muses.[53] The passages cited above and in n. 53 show that the connexion between riddles and the Muses—a connexion glimpsed earlier—is a more widespread one than one might perhaps think. Significantly, then, Homer's death as a consequence of his inability to solve a riddle comes about through a mode of discourse especially associated with the Muses.

52 For the symbolisms of the star image see Liapis (2006) 208–209 with n. 45.

53 E. *Ph.* 807b Σφίγγ' ἀπομουσοτάτοισι σὺν ᾠδαῖς, "the Sphinx with her song unblessed by the Muses"; 1028 ἄλυρον ἀμφὶ μοῦσαν, "by plying your lyreless Muse"; 1728–1731 ὅδ' εἰμὶ μοῦσαν ὃς ἐπὸ καλ- | λίνικον οὐράνιον ἔβαν | ⟨μειξο⟩παρθένου κόρας | αἴνιγμ' ἀσύνετον εὑρών, "I am the man who mounted heaven-high in victory over the song of the ⟨part-⟩maiden creature and solved her baffling riddle." Translations by Kovacs (2002) 299, 323, 393.

The ambiguities of riddling (oracular) discourse play an important part also in the biographical tradition concerning Hesiod. According to a story found in the *Certamen* 13 (West 2003, 340), but whose essentials were known already to Thucydides,[54] Hesiod was warned by an oracle to "beware of Nemean Zeus' fair grove" (Διὸς πεφύλαξο Νεμείου κάλλιμον ἄλσος), for it is there that he was destined to die. A familiar mythic pattern is subsequently activated: misunderstanding the oracle, Hesiod thought that the grove of Nemean Zeus is in Nemea; he thus avoided the Peloponnese and ended up in Locri, unaware that the region in which he took up residence was held sacred to Nemean Zeus. His hosts, under the false impression that Hesiod was fornicating with their sister, murdered the poet and threw his body into the sea. Hesiod was thus outwitted by the oracular god, and as a result of his failure he met his death. However, his death turned out to be a path to consecration: his body was carried ashore by dolphins two days later, the people who found it realized that the dead man was Hesiod, and the poet was finally buried with all due honors.[55]

According to the *Certamen* 14 (West 2003, 342), Eratosthenes in a poem entitled *Hesiod* (fr. 17 Powell)[56] said that Hesiod's murderers were sacrificed to the Gods of Hospitality (θεοὶ ξένιοι) by the seer Eurycles. Now, Athenian sources refer to an ἐγγαστρίμυθος by the name of Eurycles, who apparently professed that a divine spirit entered his belly to produce oracular utterances; he was famous enough to be mentioned by Aristophanes and Plato, although it is not clear exactly in which period he was active.[57] It may even be that there were sev-

54 Thuc. 3. 96. 1: ἐν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Νεμείου τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐν ᾧ Ἡσίοδος ὁ ποιητὴς λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν ταύτῃ ἀποθανεῖν, χρησθὲν αὐτῷ ἐν Νεμέᾳ τοῦτο παθεῖν, "… in the sacred precinct of Nemean Zeus, where Hesiod the poet is said to have died at the hands of the locals, having received an oracle to the effect that death would come to him in Nemea …"

55 The story of Hesiod's posthumous consecration is structured according to the classic pattern of Greek hero-cult: see Nagy (1999) 296–297, with reference to Brelich (1958) 321–322. Further on the legends regarding Hesiod's death and posthumous honors (including heroic status) see Lefkowitz (2012) 9–11; Compton (2006) 80–84.

56 See Powell (1925) 63; the poem may have also been entitled Ἀντερινύς.

57 Cf. Ar. *Vesp*. 1019–1020 (Aristophanes used to produce his plays through other poets) μιμησάμενος τὴν Εὐρυκλέους μαντείαν καὶ διάνοιαν, | εἰς ἀλλοτρίας γαστέρας ἐνδὺς κωμῳδικὰ πολλὰ χέασθαι, "imitating the prophetic power and mind of Eurycles, so as to pour out many comic utterances by entering other people's bellies" (cf. also schol. *ad* 1019b, p. 162 Koster). Cf. also Pl. *Soph*. 252c: (the opponents of predication are guilty of self-contradiction:) τὸ λεγόμενον οἴκοθεν τὸν πολέμιον καὶ τὸν ἐναντιωσόμενον ἔχοντες, ἐντὸς ὑποφθεγγόμενον ὥσπερ τὸν ἄτοπον Εὐρυκλέα περιφέροντες ἀεὶ πορεύονται, "as the saying goes, their enemy and opponent is in themselves, and they go about carrying him inside themselves as a mutterer, just like the outlandish Eurycles" (cf. also schol. *ad* 252c, p. 44 Greene). In a highly untypical

eral ἐγγαστρίμυθοι going by the name of Eurycles, since Plutarch suggests that "Eurycles" was merely a generic name, like "Python," applied to spirits entering the body of a "medium" and speaking prophetically through that person's mouth.[58] As we saw above, the proem of Hesiod's *Theogony* may hint at the idea that poets are receptacles to be filled by the divine voice of the Muses—"mere bellies" (γαστέρες οἶον), as Hesiod puts it, or mouthpieces of the Muses (Μοισᾶν καπυρὸν στόμα), as Theocritus was to say several centuries later (n. 7 above). If the Hesiodic singer is "a mere belly" through which the Muses speak, it is entirely appropriate that Hesiod's final (posthumous) restitution and consecration should be effected through the agency of a person whose name—Eurycles—identifies him as an ἐγγαστρίμυθος, a "medium" who receives in his belly a prophesying spirit. Hesiod's poetic function as a receptacle of the Muses' voice is thus implicitly validated in the events surrounding his death and subsequent consecration as a poet worthy of public honor.

We saw above how Homer's death resulted from his failure to solve a riddle inspired, according to an epigram by Alcaeus, by the Muses. In Hesiod's case, the fatal riddle is not posed by the Muses but by an oracle. However, as we have seen, the Muses do employ riddling discourse in their address to Hesiod at the proem of the *Theogony*: their statement to the effect that they are able to speak both truthfully and falsely is one that admits of no determinate meaning, since it makes it impossible to ascertain when the Muses are being truthful and when they are not. We are faced again with a complex of ideas in which important landmarks in the poet's career are defined by the (riddling) discourse of which the Muses are unsurpassable masters: firstly, Hesiod's *Dichterweihe* involves, crucially, a riddling statement by the Muses regarding their function as inspirers of song; secondly, Hesiod's death is the result of,

---

lapse of judgement, MacDowell (1971) *ad* Ar. *Vesp.* 1019 claimed that Eurycles was a ventriloquist in the modern sense of the word, insofar as he made his voice sound as if coming from the bellies of other people. That this cannot be true was shown conclusively by Dodds (1951) 71–72. Pearson (1917) *ad* s. fr. 59 (p. 37) was aware that Eurycles was not a ventriloquist, since "he alleged his oracles to be the voice of a demon lodged in his own breast," but called him a ventriloquist nonetheless. On Eurycles see also Katz and Volk (2000) 125.

58 *On the Disappearance of Oracles* (*De defectu oraculorum*) 414e: εὔηθες γάρ ἐστι καὶ παιδικὸν κομιδῇ τὸ οἴεσθαι τὸν θεὸν αὐτὸν ὥσπερ τοὺς ἐγγαστριμύθους Εὐρυκλέας πάλαι νυνὶ δὲ Πύθωνας προσαγορευομένους ἐνδυόμενον εἰς τὰ σώματα τῶν προφητῶν ὑποφθέγγεσθαι τοῖς ἐκείνων στόμασι καὶ φωναῖς χρώμενον ὀργάνοις, "it is altogether jejune and childish to think that the god himself—just like the belly-talkers called Eurycleses in the past and Pythons nowadays—enters prophets' bodies and mutters using their mouths and voices as instruments." Cf. Pearson (n. 57). Further on the ἐγγαστρίμυθοι in Greece (as well as in the Bible) see Katz and Volk (2000) 124–125; Sorensen (2002) 93–95.

again, a riddling oracular statement; thirdly, his death leads ultimately to consecration effected not only according to the modalities of Greek hero cult but also, significantly, thanks to the crucial mediation of "Eurycles," whose name evokes the Hesiodic Muses' implicit definition of the poet as an *engastrimuthos*-like "receptacle" of the Muses' voice. The Muses are masters of a specific mode of discourse—riddles—that governs Hesiod's initiation to poetry, death, and posthumous consecration.

Bibliography

Alexiou, M. ²2002. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (rev. ed. by D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos). Lanham.

Brelich, A. 1958. *Gli eroi greci*. Rome.

Brillante, C. 1991. "Le Muse di Thamyris." *Studi Classici e Orientali* 41: 429–453.

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Tr. J. Raffan. Oxford.

Buxton, R.G.A. 1980. "Blindness and Limits: Sophokles and the Logic of Myth." *JHS* 100: 22–37.

Clay, D. 2004. *Archilochos Heros: The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis*. Cambridge, MA.

Clay, J.S. 1997. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the 'Odyssey'*. Lanham. (First published 1983: Princeton.)

Collins, D. 1999. "Hesiod and the Divine Voice of the Muses." *Arethusa* 32: 241–262.

Compton, T.M. 2006. *Victim of the Muses: Poet as Scapegoat, Warrior, and Hero in Greco-Roman and Indo-European Myth and History*. Washington.

Detienne, M. 1996. *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece*. Tr. J. Lloyd. New York.

Dodds, E.R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.

Doherty, L.E. 1995. "Sirens, Muses, and Female Narrators in the *Odyssey*." In *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*, ed. B. Cohen, 81–92. Oxford.

Dué, C. 2002. *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis*. Lanham.

Durante, M. 1976. *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca*, vol. 2. Rome.

Edmunds, L. 2007. "Helen's Divine Origins." *Electronic Antiquity* 10.2: 1–45.

Else, G.F. 1957. "The Origin of Τραγῳδία." *Hermes* 85: 17–46.

Else, G.F. 1967. *The Origin and Early Form of Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge, MA.

Faulkner, A., ed. 2008. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford.

Ford, A.L. 1992. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca.

Freiert, W.K. 1991. "Orpheus: A Fugue on the Polis." In *Myth and the Polis*, ed. D.C. Pozzi and J.M. Wickersham, 32–48. Ithaca.

Gow, A.S.F. and D.L. Page, eds. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, vol. II, Cambridge.

Heiden, B.A. 2007. "The Muses' Uncanny Lies: Hesiod, *Theogony* 27 and Its Translators." *AJPh* 128: 153–175.

Katz, J.T., and K. Volk, 2000. "'Mere Bellies'?: A New Look at *Theogony* 26–28." *JHS* 120: 122–131.

Kovacs, D., ed. 2002. *Euripides V: Helen, Phoenician Women, Orestes* (Loeb Classical Library 11). Cambridge, MA.

Lefkowitz, M. 2012. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. 2d ed. London.

Lejeune, M. 1955. *Traité de phonétique grecque*. 2d ed. Paris.

Liapis, V. 2006. "*Ghosts, Wand'ring Here and There*: Orestes the *Revenant* in Athens." In *Dionysalexandros: Essays on Aeschylus and His Fellow Tragedians in Honour of Alexander F. Garvie*, ed. D.L. Cairns and V. Liapis, 201–231. Swansea.

Liapis, V. 2012. *A Commentary on the* Rhesus *Attributed to Euripides*. Oxford.

Lowenstam, S. 1981. *The Death of Patroklos: A Study in Typology*. Königstein.

MacDowell, D.M., ed. 1971. *Aristophanes: Wasps*. Oxford.

Murray, P. 1981. "Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece." *JHS* 101: 87–100.

Nagy, G. 1990a. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca.

Nagy, G. 1990b. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.

Nagy, G. 1996. *Homeric Questions*. Austin.

Nagy, G. 1999. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. 2d ed. Baltimore.

Paton, W.R., ed. 1919. *The Greek Anthology*, vol. II (Loeb Classical Library). London and New York.

Pearson, A.C., ed. 1917. *The Fragments of Sophocles*, vol. I. Cambridge.

Perry, B.E. 1952. *Aesopica: A Series of Texts Relating to Aesop or Ascribed to Him or Closely Connected with the Literary Tradition that Bears His Name*. Urbana and Chicago.

Plassart, A. 1926. "Fouilles de Thespies et de l'hiéron des muses de l'Hélicon. Inscriptions (6e article): Dédicaces de caractère religieux ou honorifique, bornes de domaines sacrés." *BCH* 50: 383–462.

Powell, J.U., ed. 1925. *Collectanea Alexandrina*. Oxford.

Preller, L. 1872. *Griechische Mythologie*, vol. 1. 3d ed. Berlin.

Pucci, P. 1996. "The Song of the Sirens," in *Reading the Odyssey: Selected Interpretive Essays*, ed. S.L. Schein, 191–199. Princeton. First published in *Arethusa* 12 (1979) 121–132.

Rempe J. 1927. *De Rheso Thracum heroe*. Diss. Münster.

Richardson, N.J. 1981. "The Contest of Homer and Hesiod and Alcidamas' Mouseion." *CQ* n.s. 31: 1–10.

Roesch, P. 1982. *Études béotiennes*. Paris.

Schein, S.L. 1995. "Female Representations and Interpreting the *Odyssey*," in *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*, ed. B. Cohen, 17–27. Oxford.

Schwyzer, E. 1938. *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. 1. Munich.

Segal, C. 1994. *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey*. Ithaca.

Sorensen, E. 2002. *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. Tübingen.

Stoddard, K.B. 2003. "The Programmatic Message of the 'Kings and Singers' Passage: Hesiod, *Theogony* 80–103." *TAPA* 133: 1–16.

Van Brock, N. 1959. "Substitution rituelle." *Revue hittite et asianique* 65: 117–146.

West, M.L. 1983. "Tragica VI." *BICS* 30: 63–82.

West, M.L. 1999. "The Invention of Homer." *CQ* 49: 364–382.

West, M.L., ed. 2003. *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer* (Loeb Classical Library 496). Cambridge, MA.

West, M.L. 2007. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.

Wilson, P. 2009. "Thamyris the Thracian: The Archetypal Wandering Poet?" In *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, ed. R. Hunter and I.C. Rutherford, 46–79. Cambridge.

CHAPTER 11

"Newly Written Buds:" Archaic and Classical Pseudepigrapha in Meleager's *Garland*

Irene Peirano Garrison

It is a well-known fact that the *Greek Anthology* contains a sizeable body of spurious epigrams ascribed to Anacreon, Sappho, Simonides, and other authors of the Archaic and Classical period.[1] While some are quoted in biographical and anecdotal sources, a large number of these compositions belonged to Meleager's *Garland* which, as he tells us in the preface (*AP* 4.1), featured poems written by him as well as epigrams ascribed to a number of authors of the Hellenistic and pre-Hellenistic periods. There is a broad consensus among scholars concerning the authorial status of these compositions: hardly any of the poems appear authentic and many seem to belong to the Hellenistic period, reflecting a deep desire to create retrospectively illustrious archaic ancestors for the epigrammatic genre which in essence was, if not altogether an invention of Hellenistic poets, definitely much expanded in its range by them.[2]

However, while much effort has been spent on questions of dating and authenticity, the role and function of these pseudo-epigraphic compositions in Hellenistic collections remain under-examined. For the most part, modern scholars have looked at this body of Hellenistic pseudepigrapha with a mixture of disbelief and derision: assuming that Meleager endorsed the authorial attribution of these spurious compositions by incorporating them in his collection, Page writes thus in relation to the body of pseudo-Simonidean epigrams:

> It is not easy to understand why a Hellenistic poet should circulate his own compositions under the name of Simonides, and it is a curious comment on the literary taste and judgment of the Hellenistic period that the world—even in poetic circles, as exemplified by Meleager—accepted the ascription of these latter-day exercises to Simonides without question.[3]

1 Collected in Page (1981) section 1 part II, 119–130. See also Gabathuler (1937); Barbantani (1993). The Greek text is cited from Page (1981) = *FGE* and Gow and Page (1965) = *G-P*.

2 Sens (2007).

3 Page (1981) 123.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_013

Page's puzzled reaction addresses a problem of critical importance: what is at stake when an ancient editor presents his readers with a poem by "Simonides," "Sappho" or "Anacreon"? Is the inclusion of falsely ascribed poems by an editor proof of his being "duped"? If not, what meaning does authorial ascription have for ancient readers of the *Garland* and other epigrammatic collections? The issue of how to interpret Meleager's inclusion of these poems is far from trivial: for, as Benjamin Acosta-Hughes notes in his recent study of the reception of Archaic Lyric in Hellenistic poetry, what is at stake is not the historicity of the attribution but rather its meaning and plausibility for a Hellenistic readership.[4]

Progress in deconstructing this uncomfortable gap between the stringent methods of modern authenticity criticism and the apparent gullibility of an otherwise sophisticated reader such as Meleager must begin with a serious effort to examine the practice of assumed authorship in its original historical and literary context.[5] The focus on issues of authenticity has traditionally consumed the efforts of commentators, oftentimes leading scholars to read this category of pseudepigraphic compositions as pieces floating in a literary and cultural vacuum. As a result, the contribution of the peculiar context in which the bulk of the extant poems are found—that of Meleager's multi-authored anthology—towards an understanding of the authorial persona of these pseudepigraphic texts as well as the relationship between the latter and their neighboring Hellenistic counterparts has gone unnoticed. Because of the mangled transmission history of the *Anthology*, it is often challenging to reconstruct with certainty the role that the pseudepigraphic epigrams would have played in Meleager's collection.[6] As table 1 shows, the bulk of the surviving material comes from books 6 and 7 of the *Anthology*, respectively the dedicatory and sepulchral sections, one erotic epigram is attributed to Simonides from book 5 and none are present in the epideictic or pederastic books (9 and 12).[7] This is not to say, however, that pseudepigraphic epigrams are not

4 Acosta-Hughes (2010).

5 Along these lines see, for example, Graziosi (2002) and Beecroft (2010).

6 On the question of identifying Meleagran sequences in the *Anthology* see Weisshäupl (1889); Radinger (1895); Wifstrand (1926); Gow and Page (1965) xxi–xxvii; Gutzwiller (1998) 36–46 and tables; Cameron (1992) tables. In this paper, I have followed the latter's tabulation.

7 Gutzwiller (1998) 36–37 advances the hypothesis that the first Meleagran sequence in book 6 ends at 6.132, noting that the chronological (as opposed to largely thematic) arrangement in 6.134–157 runs counter the principles of order preferred by Meleager and is evidence that the sequence was not originally part of his anthology. If so, the pseudo-Anacreontic sequence (6.134–145) would not have been part of the *Garland*.

TABLE 1 *Pseudepigrapha in the Meleagran Sequences of the* AP (*based on Cameron,* The Greek Anthology, *table*)

Book 5	Erotica	**5.134–215** 159 Simonides		
Book 6	Anathematica	**6.109–157** 133 Archilochus 134–145 Anacreon	**6.262–313** 269 Sappho 313 Bacchylides	**6.351–358**
Book 7	Epitymbia	**7.406–506** 431 unknown or Simonides 441 Archilochus 442–443 Simonides 489 Sappho 496 Simonides 505 Sappho	**7.646–665** 647 Simonides or Simias	**7.707–740**

Pseudepigrapha in the non-Meleagran Sequences of the AP

Book 6	2 Simonides 50 Simonides 52 Simonides 53 Bacchylides 197 Simonides 212–217 Simonides ?346 Anacreon	**Book 7**	20 Simonides 24 Simonides 25 Simonides 160 Anacreon 177 Simonides 226 Anacreon 248–251 Simonides 253–254 Simonides 257–258 Simonides 263 Anacreon 270 Simonides 300–302 Simonides 344 Simonides 347–348 Simonides 507 Simonides 509–516 Simonides 677 Simonides	**Book 9**	700 Simonides 715–716 Anacreon 757–758 Simonides
				Book 10	105 Simonides
				Book 13	11 Simonides 14 Simonides 17 Simonides 19 Simonides 20 Simonides 26 Simonides

at all found in these latter two books, but rather that they are not found in recognizably Meleagran sections (see table 1).[8] However, the bulk of the remaining epigrams in the *Anthology* attributed to Archaic and Classical poets outside of recognizably Meleagran sequences also come from the dedicatory and sepulchral sections. The character and provenance of these epigrams is significant and deserves comment. For not only did the anonymous authors who wrote and attributed these poems to the likes of Sappho, Anacreon and Simonides choose the two genres—dedicatory and sepulchral—which could be traced back to the Archaic and Classical periods, but the artful placement of the pseudepigrapha reveals that the editor has chosen to arrange the poems deliberately so as to endow his Hellenistic models with an Archaic and Classical pedigree.[9]

A first step towards examining the interaction between the authentic and the spurious poems in the *Garland* is to recognize that the presence of an editor significantly alters traditional distinctions between "deliberate" and "accidental" forgeries. In examining this corpus of epigrammatic pseudepigrapha, scholars have found it necessary to distinguish, whenever possible, between different types of pseudonymity. One category of texts is represented by fakes —works, that is, which falsely purport to have a specific authorial provenance. In the case of such works, often confidently identified as spurious on the basis of stylistic and chronological inconsistencies, pseudonymity is primary and organic to the work itself ("primary pseudonymity"). A second category of texts include epigrams which were not demonstrably conceived as fakes but rather mistakenly attributed to a given author by readers and editors in the course of the text's transmission. In this case, one might think of pseudonymity as an allographic or secondary phenomenon, the result of the text's reception history ("secondary or allographic pseudonymity").[10] This latter category of texts,

8 Though it must be noted that pseudepigrapha from Meleager's collection may have been lost in the huge lacuna in book 9: Cameron (1992) 24.

9 On the pre-Hellenistic context of dedicatory and sepulchral epigrams, see Day (2010), Tsagalis (2008), and Sourvinou-Inwood (1995).

10 This phenomenon is famously described by Galen who complains that the competition between Alexandria and Pergamum for acquiring books for their libraries promoted a market of ancient books which were inscribed with the name of some ancient author and sold to the highest bidder: Galen, *Hippocrates on the nature of man*, 15.105.3–6 Kühn (πρὶν γὰρ τοὺς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τε καὶ Περγάμῳ γενέσθαι βασιλεῖς ἐπὶ κτήσει παλαιῶν βιβλίων φιλοτιμηθέντας, οὐδέπω ψευδῶς ἐπεγέγραπτο σύγγραμμα. λαμβάνειν δ' ἀρξαμένων μισθὸν τῶν κομιζόντων αὐτοῖς συγγράμματα παλαιοῦ τινος ἀνδρὸς οὕτως ἤδη πολλὰ ψευδῶς ἐπιγράφοντες ἐκόμιζον). On the market of falsely inscribed books see further Zetzel (1973).

which I will call "pseudo-fakes," include, for example, poems attested anonymously on stone and transmitted in the *Greek Anthology* under the name of a given pre-Hellenistic author. Two dedications which are ascribed to Anacreon in the *Palatine Anthology* (AP 6.138/ FGE 9; AP 6.144 / FGE 15) are also attested anonymously on two fragmentary Herms from Attica (IG 1 381; IG 1.2 821). They are roughly contemporary with the poet, though not demonstrably written to be passed off as his work, and could perhaps have been included in early collections of *Anacreontea* on the basis of their date and style.[11] These collections, as David Sider has argued in relation to the so-called *Sylloge Simonidea*, developed as early as the fifth or fourth century and were probably used by Meleager in compiling his *Garland*.[12]

Oftentimes, however, it is hard (and arguably unhelpful) to distinguish whether a poem is a fake or a pseudo-fake. To start with, there are cases in which the ascription to the poet found in the manuscript tradition is doubtful and considerable uncertainty exists as to whether the poem's attribution goes back to antiquity or to a later stage in the text's transmission history. The case of the pseudo-Sapphic corpus well illustrates the challenges and rewards of studying the adoption of Sappho's authorial persona in the context of the anthology format and the complex interaction between the voices of the editor, pseudo-author, and reader. In total, three poems survive attributed to the Lesbian poetess, and all come from Meleagran sequences. The first one of these (AP 6.269/ FGE 1) is a sophisticated dedication in which a stone, presumably the very statue which is being dedicated, speaks and reads the dedication with which it is inscribed and which records Arista's offering to Artemis Aethopia. The epigram, written in Aeolic dialect and dedicated to a cult figure from nearby Euripus (cf. Pfeiffer on Callimachus fr. 702 and Strabo 13.617), is credible as a specimen of Sapphic poetry. However, here the antiquity of the ascription is in question: the poem is absent in one manuscript, and the heading in another reads not Sappho's but "in the manner of Sappho's" (ΩΣ ΣΑΠΦΟΥΣ).[13] It is uncertain whether the heading goes back to Meleager himself or whether it was inserted or modified by the compiler who was suspicious about the ascription.

The second pseudo-Sapphic poem is confidently labeled as a Hellenistic forgery by Page.[14] It belongs to a sequence of epigrams (AP 7.486–493) on girls who died before their wedding day, and its proximity to two poems by the

11 On these collections see West (1974) 20.

12 Sider (2007). The epigrams ascribed to Simonides have been recently collected in Bravi (2006), and see further Boas (1905) and Petrovic (2007).

13 A similar heading is found in AP 6.273 and 12.142.

14 Page (1981) 127 calls this and other poems in the same category "deliberate forgeries."

female writer Anyte on the same topic (*AP* 7.486/ *G-P* 5 and *AP* 7.490/ *G-P* 6) is meant to suggest the importance of Sappho as a model for Anyte, a role alluded to in Meleager's prefatory poem where Sappho is mentioned first in the company of Anyte and other women poets (*AP* 4.1.5–6; cf. Posidippus 55 A–B).

Finally, the last poem seems late in date but not specifically Sapphic in style or content, but its meaning is rather determined by its placement in Meleager's collection. The piece belongs to a sequence of epigrams on men who died at sea (*AP* 7.494–506)[15]—specifically a sub-section on fishermen (7.504–506)—and it is preceded and followed by two epigrams by Leonidas of Tarentum. In comparison to Leonidas' poems, the pseudepigraphon is remarkably simple and easily classifiable as functional and therefore archaic. On the basis of our knowledge of Sappho, it is hard to see anything specifically Sapphic about the couplet, though the possibility exists that we have lost relevant context from Sappho's poetry. Yet, the internal arrangement of this section appears to be critical to an understanding of the poem: the sequence opens with an anonymous poem whose closing comment on the very impossibility of operating distinctions (*AP* 7.494.3–4 "but the sea in a storm does not distinguish between fishermen and others" θάλασσα / οὔ τι διακρίνει χείματος οὐδ' ἁλιεῖς) thematizes its uncertain authorial status. As Gutzwiller alerts us, with its initial line hinting at the speaker's double burial at sea and in the earth, the final poem of the sequence, Leonidas *G-P* 65, is also self-consciously placed as a transition from sea to land epitaphs which make up the section immediately following. The pseudo-Sapphic epigram, sandwiched between two long poems by Leonidas on dead fishermen, not only provides *variatio* but also offers the Lesbian poet as an illustrious poetic ancestor for Leonidas' concern with humble people, working folks, and women.

To track further the meaningful interaction between the pseudepigraphic compositions and Hellenistic poetry, I turn now to a pseudo-Simonidean epigram which happens to be the only surviving pseudepigraphon from the erotic section of Meleager's *Garland*. It is part of a group of poems (5.158–163) on *hetaerae* of which it is the only non-Hellenistic example. The pseudo-Simonidean poem (*AP* 5.159/ *FGE* 60) is an ironic dedication to the goddess of Love by two retired *hetaerae*, a flute-player named Boidion, and a certain Pythias.

---

15 See Gutzwiller (1998) 313–314 on this section of the *epitymbia*. "Simonides" 68 *FGE* is part of this section, while 72, 76 a–b *FGE* are other *nauagika* attributed to the poet but found outside of Meleagran sequences: see Bravi (2006) 34.

Βοίδιον ηὐλητρὶς καὶ Πυθιάς, αἵ ποτ' ἐρασταί,
σοί, Κύπρι, τὰς ζώνας τάς τε γραφὰς ἔθεσαν.
ἔμπορε καὶ φορτηγέ, τὸ σὸν βαλλάντιον οἶδεν,
καὶ πόθεν αἱ ζῶναι καὶ πόθεν οἱ πίνακες.
AP 5.159/ SIMONIDES *FGE* 60

Boidion, the flute-player, and Pythias, both lovely once upon a time, dedicated to you, Cypris, these girdles and pictures. Trader and merchant, your purse knows from where the girdles and from where the pictures came.

The first couplet reads like an actual dedication of the girdles and pictures—presumably self-portraits—of the women who are retiring from their profession. It is only in the second couplet that we discover that the speaking voice is not that of the women but of a disenchanted third observer who remarks that the *hetaerae* have obtained the money for their girdles from their clients—merchants and seamen. This epigram containing the dedication of the financial profits of two *hetaerae* may have been purposely composed with the intent of being passed off as Simonidean.[16] For the emphasis on financial profit in this epigram is consonant with the traditional portrayal of Simonides as a miser.[17] Another epigram ascribed to Simonides but found outside of Meleagran sequences also comments on the death of a merchant at sea as arising from his greed (*AP* 7.254b.2 κατ' ἐμπορίαν). The choice of the *pinakes* as an object of dedication is also relevant since Simonides was renowned for his interest in the relationship between poetry and painting (Plut., *De Gloria Atheniensium* 346f). On the other hand, the piece may have been circulated anonymously and later included in a collection of *Simonidea* because the financial spin on the erotic theme suited the widespread representation of Simonides as a miser.

Be that as it may, whatever its original dating and authorial source, the poem arguably achieves a new meaning in the context of the Meleagran collection where it is presented as Simonidean. Here, the anthology format collapses the distinction between primary and secondary pseudonymity: for an editor, *qua* selector, effectively re-authors an anonymous poem when he ascribes it to a known figure of the literary past. Within Meleager's erotic book, the epigram introduces a sequence of six poems by Meleager himself, Asclepiades, and pos-

16 Gow and Page (1965) 517.

17 For Simonides' reputation as a profiteering money-grabber see Xenophanes fr. 21B Diels-Kranz; Aristophanes *Peace* 698 ff.; Chamaleon fr. 33 Wehrli; Callimachus fr. 222 Pfeiffer and further Lefkowitz (1981) 49–53.

sibly Hedylus, on the subject of *hetaerae*.[18] The pseudo-Simonidean dedication of the girdles and pictures is thematically connected with a poem of Asclepiades (5.158/ G-P 4) which concluded the previous section and which ended with the fully cited inscription on Hermione's girdle (5.158.2; cf. 5.159.2 ζώνας). Moreover, Boidion and Pythias, the names of the pseudo-Simonidean *haetaerae*, recur in two other epigrams from this section also on prostitutes by Asclepiades (5.164/ G-P 13: Pythias) and one which is ascribed to Asclepiades in some manuscripts and to Hedylus in others (5.161/ Asclepiades G-P 40: Boidion).[19] Fittingly, given its invocation to the night, the first of these, Asclepiades G-P 13/ AP 5.164, stands at the end of the section on prostitutes which is therefore framed at the beginning and end by references to Boidion. This ring-composition is clearly deliberate: Meleager has prefaced his work and that of Asclepiades with the pseudo-Simonidean model thus not only creating thematic unity but also constructing an artificial literary history in which "Simonides" is seen as the *prōtos heuretēs* of this Hellenistic genre.[20]

Having examined the role of the anthology format in framing readers' approach to the pseudepigrapha, we may now move to Meleager's prefatory poem to his *Garland* and analyze his representations of the archaic and classical authors under whose name the pseudepigrapha in his collection are found. Among the four dozen poets which he cites as making up his collection, there are five pre-Hellenistic figures: Sappho, who features last in the first couplet together with fellow female poets Anyte and Moero; Simonides is referred to in one line (v. 8), while Bacchylides, Anacreon, and Archilochus are mentioned in three adjoining couplets. Meleager describes himself as a maker of a "garland of poets" (v. 2 ὁ καὶ τεύξας ὑμνοθετᾶν στέφανον), but the prefatory poem also contains a little studied but no less interesting declaration of authorial poetics emphatically placed in the final lines:

ἄλλων τ' ἔρνεα πολλὰ νεόγραφα· τοῖς δ' ἅμα Μούσης
καὶ σφετέρης ἔτι που πρώϊμα λευκόϊα.

18 See Gutzwiller (1998) 293–294 for a discussion of this section.

19 The most recent discussion of the attribution question is in Sens (2011) 267–268, who finds the manuscript evidence insufficient to decide the issue.

20 It is often impossible to tell whether in such cases writers such as Asclepiades imitated and responded to pseudepigraphic compositions or whether in fact the anonymous composers constructed archaizing examples to provide illustrious fictional exemplary models for contemporary texts. Gutzwiller (1998) 56–57 discusses the ambiguous relationship between a number of epigrams by Anyte (1–2 G-P) and a number of pseudo-Simonidean and pseudo-Anacreontic poems.

ἀλλὰ φίλοις μὲν ἐμοῖσι φέρω χάριν· ἔστι δὲ μύσταις
κοινὸς ὁ τῶν Μουσέων ἡδυεπὴς στέφανος.

AP. 4.1.55–58

And the newly written buds of many others, and with all these the early white violets of his own Muse. To my friends, I bring the gift, but the sweet-voiced garland of the Muses is common to all the initiates.

The final couplet develops around a μέν-δέ oppositon: Meleager brings this gift to his friends, but to the initiates the sweet garland of the Muses is a common property. The two terms *philoi* and *mystai* appropriately frame the hexameter. The meaning of this last couplet becomes clearer if we see the *philoi* as a reference to Diocles, the friend whom Meleager mentions as the dedicatee of the *kharis* of poetry in v. 4. Though the *stephanos* is a personal gift, its contents are shared property of *all* poets.[21] At the most basic level, the *koinōnia* of the poetry may be taken to refer to the editor's right to incorporate other people's work in his collection. But in a bolder sense, the shared nature of the poetry also refers to a defining characteristic of the epigrammatic genre, well-studied by Sonya Tarán, namely its infinite potential for variation and the broad scope allowed to individual authors to engage and closely rework previous models.[22] This metaphorical usage of *koinos* in the context of ancient practices of imitation is alluded to in a mangled passage of the *Ars Poetica* (128–135), in which Horace, borrowing from Hellenistic literary theory, highlights the difficulty of "treating in one's own way common themes" (v. 128 *proprie communia dicere*) and the need to give a personal touch to the *publica materies* (v. 131) of epic subject-matter.[23] The adj. *koinos* then alludes to the potential for the poetry contained in the *stephanos* to be appropriated and remade. The *koinōnia* of the poetry may be taken to refer to Meleager's right to provide his own spin or variation on a predecessor's motif, and yet I would argue that this open and shared characteristic extends not just to the poetry, which one is free to appropriate, but to the very name and persona of the author whose identity one can borrow and whose corpus one can treat as open to expansion and creative refashioning.

Though some of the pseudo-archaic epigrams are presented as remains of the past and the gift of the *stephanos* as one "which engenders remembrance" (v. 4 μναμόσυνον … χάριν), Meleager also emphasizes the newness of the poetry

---

21 Thus Gow and Page (1965) 606 ad loc.

22 Tarán (1979).

23 Brink (1963) 204–207 ad loc. and further Reiff (1959) 70 with n. 116. For this use of *koinos*/*communis* see Philodemus, *Peri Poiem.* 195 Janko; *AP* 12.104, and Callimachus *Ep.* 28 Pfeiffer.

therein contained. The catalogue of flowers concludes with a generic reference to the "many newly written shoots" of other poets to which Meleager's own flowering compositions will be added. Since the last couplet in Meleager's list refers to two roughly contemporary epigrammatists (Theodorides and Phanias), it seems reasonable to assume that the poet is referring to other authors roughly contemporary (and hence "new") whom he does not mention. However, the term *neos* appears at other junctures in this poem as a term applied not just to contemporary poetry, such as "the young shoots of Alexander's olive" (v. 39), but also "the young branch of the vine of Simonides" (v. 8). It may be right that *neos* should here be translated, as Page argues, with "flowering" but it is also possible that Meleager is here alluding to the rebirth and regeneration of Simonides in the hugely popular pseudo-Simonidea. On this interpretation, the *neographa* of v. 55 is ambiguous: on the surface, it refers to the newness of the youngest poets of the *Garland*. But it also signals the possibility of reading the old poetry as "newly made". The difficulty of translating Anacreon into elegy in v. 36 is typically read as a reference to the metrical challenges involved in fitting Anacreon's name into an hexameter, but it is tempting to see Meleager here alluding to the rival flourishing genre of *Anacreontea*, poems written in the style of Anacreon, and in mostly lyric meters.

Furthermore, not only is the prefatory poem playing with the notion of writing the literary past anew, but the poems themselves offer a rich, self-conscious commentary on issues of authorship and literary identity. In the first instance, as the example of the only surviving Bacchylidean epigram from the *Garland* (6.313/*FGE* 2) will show, the assumed authorial voice of the pseudepigrapha is closely connected with that of the editor and poet himself in ways that already suggest the possibility of reading "Bacchylides" as an extension of Meleager. This poem seems to have had a prominent structural role in Meleager's collection, marking the end of a sequence of dedication poems by men, whereby gesturing to the pre-Hellenistic roots of this genre.[24] Unlike other pseudo-archaic epigrams in which the authorial ascription is an external matter, this Bacchylidean poem is unique in containing a direct reference to the name of the poet:

> Κούρα Πάλλαντος πολυώνυμε, πότνια Νίκα,
>   πρόφρων Κραναΐδων ἱμερόεντα χορὸν
> αἰὲν ἐποπτεύοις, πολέας δ᾽ ἐν ἀθύρμασι Μουσᾶν
>   Κηίῳ ἀμφιτίθει Βακχυλίδῃ στεφάνους.
>
> *AP* 6.313/ BACCHYLIDES *FGE* 2

24 Gutzwiller (1998) 303–306.

> Famed daughter of Pallas, lady Nike, with good will you always look upon the lovely dance of the sons of Kranaos, and in the pastime of Muses place many crowns on Bacchylides of Ceos.

The language is Bacchylidean in diction and yet the poem is hardly persuasive as a historical inscription.[25] As Page himself notes, the epigram contains no reference to either a dedicating object or an occasion but is rather a prayer to bestow many prizes onto Bacchylides for his poetry.[26] Kathryn Gutzwiller has pointed out that the phrase ἀμφιτίθει … στεφάνους in v. 4 occurred in an epigram of Meleager from the erotic book (5.136/*G-P* 42.4 μναμόσυνον κείνας ἀμφιτίθει στέφανον) which stood near the beginning of a Meleagrean sequence, thereby suggesting that Meleager framed the erotic and dedicatory books with two poems (his and the pseudo-Bacchylides') containing mentions of a *stephanos*.[27] Crucially, the self-referential allusion to the title of Meleager's collection in the voice of Bacchylides constructs the epinician poet as an authorial surrogate to the editor and suggests the possibility of reading the poem as Meleager's own work.

A second pseudo-Bacchylidean poem from Book 6 of the *AP* contains potentially significant metapoetic imagery about authorial identity and poetic composition that has clear connections with Meleager's prefatory poem, and though outside of a recognizably Meleagrean sequence, it is a prime candidate for the missing poem which began Meleager's dedicatory book:[28]

Εὔδημος τὸν νηὸν ἐπ' ἀγροῦ τόνδ' ἀνέθηκε
  τῷ πάντων ἀνέμων πιοτάτῳ Ζεφύρῳ·
εὐξαμένῳ γάρ οἱ ἦλθε βοαθόος, ὄφρα τάχιστα
  λικμήσῃ πεπόνων καρπὸν ἀπ' ἀσταχύων.

AP 6.53/BACCHYLIDES *FGE* 1

> Eudemus dedicated this temple in the field to Zephyrus, the richest of all winds. For as he prayed, he came hasting to help so as to reap the crop from the ripe ears of corn.

25 E.g. ἐν ἀθύρμασι Μουσᾶν: Bacchyl. *Ep.* 9.87; 18.57; v. 4 στεφάνους: *Ep.* 2.10; 4.16; 6.8; v. 2 πολυώνυμε: Pindar *Pyth* 1.17.

26 Page (1981) 152 calls this "a mere literary exercise."

27 Gutzwiller (1998) 305.

28 A possibility already suggested by Gutzwiller (1998) 305.

Page calls this poem "a literary exercise and an uncommonly unrealistic one" chiefly on account of the fact that Zephyrus is not a god worshipped in temples.[29] Unrealistic though it may be as a historical dedication by Bacchylides, it ties very well into the prefatory poem where the Cean poet's work is referred to as "the yellow eared corn from the reed of Bacchylides" (4.1.34 ξανθοὺς ἐκ καλάμης Βακχυλίδεω στάχυας). Since "harvesting" is a prime metaphor for poetic composition in Meleager's own poem (4.1.17; cf. *AP* 12.98 Posidippus; 4.2.3 Philip), the prayer for abundant harvest in this peculiar dedication of a temple to Zephyrus may hint at the abundance of "Bacchylidean" poetry to be reaped for inclusion in the collection.

Moreover, issues of authenticity and authorial attribution are commented on through the implicit literary dialogue not only between the pseudepigrapha and Meleager's programmatic editorial poem but also between adjoining poems. Three pseudo-Simonidean poems in a Meleagran sequence from book 7 purport to celebrate dead warriors. 7.442–443 (Simonides *FGE* 54, 47) are concerned with the battle for the city of Tegea, an episode possibly part of the Persian wars.[30] 7.431/ Simonides *FGE* 65 professes to be an inscription for the tomb of the Spartans who had died in the Battle of Thyrea in which the two surviving Argives first claimed victory only to realize that one Spartan named Othryadas had survived and inscribed a trophy with blood.[31] Six poems beside 7.431 deal with the battle of Thyrea: 7.720–721 by Chaeremon, an unknown post-Classical epigrammatist, 7.432 by Damagetus, 7.244 by Gaetulicus, and 7.526 by Nicander, together with other Hellenistic examples dealing more in general with Spartan heroism. Finally, the pseudo-Simonidean epigram is preceded by a poem of Dioscorides (7.430/ *G-P* 31) and the two are clearly forming a sequence. Dioscorides' poem is put in the mouth of the two Argive survivors as they return on the battlefield and discover the Spartan shield inscribed with the blood of Othryadas:

29 Page (1981) 150.

30 Page (1981) 278–279 ad loc. and cf. Simonides *FGE* 53 on the same theme. Simonides who had written about the battle of Platea (fr. 10–17 West) was credited already by Herodotus (7.228) with an epigram on the prophet Megisthias who died at Thermopylae and which is found anonymous in the AP. It is possible as Page argued that the Herodotean epitaph could have formed an original nucleus which attracted both anonymous 5th century epigrams concerning the Persian Wars and later exercises on the theme.

31 The story is found in Herodotus 1.82. For its popularity in Hellenistic literature, see Gow and Page (1965) 221.

Τίς τὰ νεοσκύλευτα ποτὶ δρυῒ τᾷδε καθᾶψεν
　ἔντεα; τῶ πέλτα Δωρὶς ἀναγράφεται;
πλάθει γὰρ Θυρεᾶτις ὑφ' αἵματος ἅδε λοχιτᾶν,
　χἀμὲς ἀπ' Ἀργείων τοὶ δύο λειπόμεθα.
πάντα νέκυν μάστευε δεδουπότα, μή τις ἔτ' ἔμπνους
　λειπόμενος Σπάρτᾳ κῦδος ἔλαμψε νόθον.
ἴσχε βάσιν. νίκα γὰρ ἐπ' ἀσπίδος ὧδε Λακώνων
　φωνεῖται θρόμβοις αἵματος Ὀθρυάδα,
χὠ τόδε μοχθήσας σπαίρει πέλας. ἆ πρόπατορ Ζεῦ,
　στύξον ἀνικάτου σύμβολα φυλόπιδος.

AP 7.430/DIOSCORIDES *G-P* 31

Who hung the newly-stripped arms on this oak? By whom is the Dorian shield inscribed? This land of Thyrea is full with the blood of fighters and we are the only two left of the Argives. Seek each fallen corpse, lest anyone left still breathing shine spurious glory upon Sparta. Hold your foot! For here the victory of the Spartans is proclaimed on the shield by lumps of Othyrades' blood, and he who brought this about with toil is still breathing close by. Oh forefather Zeus, abhor these tokens of a battle that was not won.

The Argives' question (v. 2 "by whom is the Dorian shield inscribed"), with which the poem opens, is answered in the pseudo-Simonidean epigram which follows right after and which purports to be the very inscription commemorating Othryadas' sacrifice. Moreover, Dioscorides' epigram seems to reflect on the issue of the authenticity of the pseudo-Simonidean epigram to which it is either directly or indirectly responding. For the surviving Argives invite each other "to seek out every fallen corpse lest anyone left still breathing shine spurious glory upon Sparta" (7.430.5–6 πάντα νέκυν μάστευε δεδουπότα, μή τις ἔτ' ἔμπνους / λειπόμενος Σπάρτᾳ κῦδος ἔλαμψε νόθον). In presenting the *kudos* arising from the inscription as spurious—*nothos* being a word used of literary texts deemed inauthentic[32]—Dioscorides suggests that he is engaging with a text that may attempt to breathe life into the past but is no substitute for the genuine authentic document. The image of the survivor still gasping for air (v. 5 ἔμπνους; v. 9 σπαίρει) is realized in the following poem which proclaims (v. 6 καρύσσει) and memorializes Othryadas' undying glory.

32 On the use of *nothos* in the context of ancient *Echtheitskritik* see Speyer (1971) 121–122.

Indeed, the theme of immortality—the notion, that is, that the poet's fame, poetry, and even his very self, are undying—is pervasive in epigrams written by Hellenistic authors about the very poets whose voices are surreptitiously appropriated in the pseudepigrapha:[33] in Antipater of Sidon's words, Sappho's garland of song is "always living" (7.14.4 ἀείζωον Πιερίδων στέφανον), Sophocles' pages are "eternal" (Simias: 7.21.6 ἀθανάτοις ... ἐν σελίσιν), Anacreon is "an immortal singer of hymns" (pseudo-Simonides 7.25.1–2 τὸν ἄφθιτον ... ὑμνοπόλον), who even in Hades "does not cease from song delightful as honey" (7.25.9 μολπῆς δ' οὐ λήγει μελιτερπέος). Unstoppable, undying song is used as a metaphor for the continuation of Anacreon's poetry in the preface to the *Anacreontea* which advertises the coming poems as the work of an impersonator. The anonymous impersonator presents himself as the author of the collection and describes a meeting with Anacreon himself in which he kissed the old poet's lips. The erotic encounter results in a transfer of poetic power and identity which is manifested in the fact that the anonymous has taken up lovemaking, one of the poet's favorite activities besides drinking, and has not "ceased from love ever since" (*Anacr.* 1.15–16 καὶ νῦν/ ἔρωτος οὐ πέπαυμαι).[34] Thus the praise of the singer's immortality, which is of course one of the most conventional and ubiquitous of topoi, assumes a new, more practical meaning in Hellenistic poetry where authors of the classical and archaic ages are not just addressed but literally resurrected in new verse.[35] In Callimachus *Iamb* 1, Hipponax comes back from the dead and addresses the crowd of erudite Alexandrians. In the third book of the *Aitia*, a Simonides *redivivus* complains that his tomb in Agrigentum has been disassembled and moved to be reused in the construction of the city walls. It is not hard to see in this anecdote a self-conscious comment on Callimachus' poetic appropriation of Simonides' voice in his poem: just as the anonymous general "inserted" the tomb stone in the new architectural piece (fr. 64.7 πύργῳ] δ' ἐγκατέλεξεν ἐμὴν λίθον), so Callimachus reuses the Archaic poet in his poetic edifice, proposing his variation on the Hellenistic genre of fake epitaphs which purport to be the tombstone of a long-dead poet.

Authorial ventriloquism also features prominently in the *Anthology*, where Hellenistic poets regularly author compositions in which classical and archaic writers take center-stage. In a sequence of eleven epigrams from book 7 of

33 The corpus has been studied by Gabathuler (1937) but see also Bing (1993) and Rossi (2001).

34 As Patricia Rosenmeyer has argued, the poem plays with the transfer of authorial identity from the start with the final merging of identities between the model and the impersonator being activated by the erotic kiss: Rosenmeyer (1992) 62–73.

35 Bing (1988).

the *Palatine Anthology* on the subject of the poet Anacreon (7.23–33) and attributed to one or the other of the Antipaters, Dioscorides, Julian, and "Simonides," one by Antipater of Sidon is written in the voice of Anacreon:

> Ξεῖνε, τάφον παρὰ λιτὸν Ἀνακρείοντος ἀμείβων,
> εἴ τί τοι ἐκ βίβλων ἦλθεν ἐμῶν ὄφελος,
> σπεῖσον ἐμῇ σποδιῇ, σπεῖσον γάνος, ὄφρα κεν οἴνῳ
> ὀστέα γηθήσῃ τἀμὰ νοτιζόμενα,
> ὡς ὁ Διωνύσου μεμελημένος εὐάσι κώμοις,
> ὡς ὁ φιλακρήτου σύντροφος ἁρμονίης
> μηδὲ καταφθίμενος Βάκχου δίχα τοῦτον ὑποίσω
> τὸν γενεῇ μερόπων χῶρον ὀφειλόμενον.
>
> *AP* 7.26 / ANTIPATER *G-P* 14

> Stranger who pass by the stone tomb of Anacreon, if any good came to you from my books, make a libation to my ashes, pour some bright liquid, so that my bones may rejoice refreshed with wine, so that I who cared for loud-voiced revels of Dionysus, so that I who dwelled with wine-loving harmony even in death may not bear the burden of this land which is owed to the offspring of men without wine.

Addressing a passerby, Anacreon speaking from the Underworld pleads to be granted one more drink.[36] The wine (v. 3 οἴνῳ) of the libation takes the place of the wine-loving (v. 6 φιλακρήτου) music which Anacreon composed. The positions of reader-author or addressor-addressee exist here in a state of extreme fluidity: for while the reader-addressee is asked to perform the libation, it is the poem itself which in a sense is the offering that the poet requests. Thus the wine both symbolizes Anacreon's own poetry and is the poetic offering that "Anacreon" is requesting. In turn, the addressee, who stops by the stone, is also an image of the reader of the poem who stops to read the text and thus becomes involved in bringing the dead poet back to life. In this way, Antipater can be seen to explicitly comment on his own appropriation of another poet's voice and on the process of restaging the literary past. It is no coincidence then that in the next poem, also by Antipater, Anacreon's whole life is defined as "a libation to the three divinities of the Muses, Dionysus, and Eros" (7.27.9–10 τρισσοῖς γάρ, Μούσαισι, Διωνύσῳ καὶ Ἔρωτι, / πρέσβυ, κατεσπείσθη πᾶς ὁ τεὸς βίοτος).

36 The image of Anacreon as a wine-lover explains the recurrent presence of Dionysus in the long section of pseudo-Anacreontea from the dedicatory book (6.134–145): see esp. 6.134; 6.140; 6.142; 6.145.

In this paper, I have attempted to interpret the surreptitious usages of the name and persona of pre-Hellenistic authors in Meleager's *Garland* through an exploration of the language of authorship and authenticity within the anthology. For, when read not in isolation but in the context of the poetry book, the poems both in and of themselves and by virtue of their placement can be seen to comment self-consciously on their playful appropriation of a dead author's voice. Examining the evidence for the role of pseudepigraphic compositions in Meleager's collection and their placement and interaction with the "modern" poetry of the Hellenistic era, I have argued that the implied reader of these Hellenistic fakes is not necessarily Page's naïve, unhistorically minded victim but a willing participant in the fictional restaging of the past with poets and editor both reacting to and self-consciously commenting on the assumption of a fictional authorial persona in the context of the epigrammatic genre. In this literary culture in which, as in Antipater's portrayal of an Anacreon *redivivus*, the roles of author and reader are easily interchangeable, assumed authorship is not necessarily an act of deception but a playful challenge to continue, resurrect, and even embody the past.

Bibliography

Acosta-Hughes, B. 2010. *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*. Princeton.

Barbantani, S. 1993. "I poeti lirici del canone alessandrino nell'epigrammistica." *Aevum antiquum* 6: 5–97.

Beecroft, A. 2010. *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China: Patterns of Literary Circulation*. Cambridge.

Bing, P. 1988. *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*. Göttingen.

Bing, P. 1993. "The Bios-Tradition and Poets' Lives in Hellenistic Poetry." In *Nomodeiktes: Greek studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*, ed. R. Rosen and J. Farrell, 619–631. Ann Arbor.

Boas, M. 1905. *De epigrammatis Simonideis. Pars prior: commentatio critica de epigrammatum traditione*. Groningen.

Bravi, L. 2006. *Gli epigrammi di Simonide e le vie della tradizione. Filologia e critica*. Rome.

Brink, C.O. 1963. *Horace on poetry*. 3 vols. Cambridge.

Cameron, A. 1992. *The Greek Anthology: From Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford.

Day, J.W. 2010. *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance*. Cambridge.

Gabathuler, M. 1937. *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter*. Leipzig.

Gow, A.S.F., and D.L. Page. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge.

Graziosi, B. 2002. *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of the Epic*. Cambridge.

Gutzwiller, K.J. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context, Hellenistic Culture and Society*. Berkeley.

Lefkowitz, M.R. 1981. *The lives of the Greek poets*. London.

Page, D.L. 1981. *Further Greek epigrams*. Cambridge.

Petrovic, A. 2007. *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften*. Leiden.

Radinger, C. 1895. *Meleagros von Gadara. Eine litterargeschichtliche Skizze*. Innsbruck.

Reiff, A. 1959. *Interpretatio, imitatio, aemulatio. Begriff und Vorstellung literarischer Abhängigkeit bei den Römern*. Diss. Cologne.

Rosenmeyer, P.A. 1992. *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition*. Cambridge.

Rossi, L. 2001. *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach*.

Sens, A. 2007. "One Thing Leads (Back) to Another: Allusion and the Invention of Tradition." In *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, ed. P. Bing and J.S. Bruss, 373–390. Leiden.

Sens, A. 2011. *Asclepiades of Samos: Epigrams and Fragments*. Oxford.

Sider, D. 2007. "Sylloge Simonidea." In *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, ed. P. Bing and J.S. Bruss, 113–130. Leiden.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1995. *Reading Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period*. Oxford.

Speyer, W. 1971. *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. Munich.

Tarán, S.L. 1979. *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.

Tsagalis, C. 2008. *Inscribing Sorrow: Fourth-Century Attic Funerary Epigrams*. Berlin.

Weisshäupl, R. 1889. *Die Grabgedichte der griechischen Anthologie*. Vienna.

West, M.L. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin.

Wifstrand, A. 1926. *Studien zur griechischen Anthologie*. Lund.

Zetzel, J.E.G. 1973. "Emendavi ad Tironem: Some Notes on Scholarship in the Second Century A.D." *HSCPh* 77: 225–243.

CHAPTER 12

Sappho or Alcaeus: Authors and Genres of Archaic Hymns

Leanna Boychenko

There are 42 fragments listed under the title *incertum utrius auctoris fragmenta* at the end of Eva-Maria Voigt's *Sappho et Alcaeus*. Among these unidentified fragments are some printed in full, while others have found new homes among the comparatively *certum* fragments attributed to either Sappho or Alcaeus. In the case of this latter group, there is often good reason to attribute the fragments to one author or the other, frequently based on ancient scholarly commentary. Voigt's Sappho 117b, for example, is quoted by a Roman grammarian of the third century CE, Marius Plotius Sacerdos, to demonstrate the Sapphic *dimetrum dactylicum*:

a Ἔσπερ' ὑμήναον
b ὦ τὸν Ἀδώνιον

a Hesperus! Hymenaeos!
b Oh Adonian!

Even without the ancient attribution, the content of these fragments corresponds to some of the known themes of Sappho's songs. A wedding. Adonis. Certainly these lines look Sapphic.[1] Edgar Lobel and Denys Page, however, printed these two fragments as inc. auct. 24 and T. Bergk suggested that example b was made up.[2] H. Keil even more discriminately dismissed both as *fictum*.[3] These lines certainly look Sapphic, but are they?

The authenticity of Sappho 117b V has been questioned, but neither part a nor b has ever been attributed to another poet. For some fragments, however, the question is not whether they were composed by Sappho, but whether we should attribute them to Sappho or Alcaeus. Here, I focus on one such contro-

1 Cf. Campbell (1982) 451.
2 Bergk (1866) 911.
3 Keil (1874) 517.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_014

versial fragment known as Alcaeus 304 or Sappho 44a. Just as we saw with Sappho 117b V above, the content of this fragment has contributed to its attribution to Sappho, for it is part of a hymn to Artemis. Praising a virgin goddess seems a fitting topic for a female composer, especially one who may very well have been writing choral songs for young girls.[4] It is my supposition, however, that in this case genre is a better criterion than content for determining whether a hymn belongs in the tradition of Sappho or Alcaeus, who I argue wrote different types of hymns.

Publication and Attribution: Sappho or Alcaeus?

Discovered in a papyrus from the second or third century CE, Alcaeus 304/Sappho 44a was published by Lobel and Page in 1952. Their article in the *Classical Quarterly* called the lines "A New Fragment of Aeolic Verse" and identified it as part of a hymn to Artemis. They determined there was insufficient evidence for deciding between the two Lesbian authors, but leaned toward Alcaeus due to a metrical question. I provide their printing of P. Fouad Inv. no. 239 below:

[ ]σανορεσ̣. .[(1)
[ ]μ̣αι τὸν ἔτικτε Κόω .[
[Κρ]ονίδαι μεγαλωνύμω̣⟨ι⟩
[ ]μέγαν ὄρκον ἀπώμοσε

4 Cf. Calame (1977) 367–372; (1997) 210–214. "Artemis" only appears once in the extant works attributed to Sappho in fr. 84 LP: Ἄρτεμι̣. There is not enough of the poorly preserved fragment to determine context. It is possible that Artemis is referred to in the very fragmentary 99 LP (= Alc. 303a V), which seems to be a hymn to Apollo. The word ἀδελφέαν appears in line 11. Campbell's Testimonium 21 (Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 30.15) speaks of a contemporary of Sappho who writes hymns to Artemis, but does not clearly say that Sappho wrote these as well (see p. 242 for discussion of this testimonium) and Testimonium 47 (Menander Rhetor Διαίρεσις τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν 333, 334) mentions the cletic hymns of Sappho and Alcman, who call Artemis from the mountains and Aphrodite from Cyprus, but it is not clear whether he is speaking generally or giving specific examples: ἀναμιμνήσκειν γὰρ πολλῶν τόπων ἐκείνοις ἔξεστιν, ὡς παρὰ τῇ Σαπφοῖ καὶ τῷ Ἀλκμᾶνι πολλαχοῦ εὑρίσκομεν. τὴν μὲν γὰρ Ἄρτεμιν ἐκ μυρίων ὀρέων, μυρίων δὲ πόλεων, ἔτι δὲ ποταμῶν ἀνακαλεῖ, τὴν δὲ Ἀφροδίτην ⟨ἐκ⟩ Κύπρου, Κνίδου, Συρίας, πολλαχόθεν ἀλλαχόθεν ἀνακαλεῖ. (For it is possible for them to recall them from many places, as we find many times in Sappho and in Alcman. For he calls Artemis from many mountains and many cities, and again from rivers, and she calls Aphrodite from Cyprus, Knidos, Syria, and from many other places). τὴν … τὴν in the second sentence is sometimes edited to ὁ … ἡ to avoid the ambiguity. This would also remove the mention of Sappho's hymns to Artemis.

[ ]λαν· ἄϊ πάρθενος ἔσσομαι
[ ].ων ὀρέων κορύφαιͅσ᾽ ἔπι
[ ]δ̣ε νεῦσον ἔμαν χάριν·
[ ].ε θέων μακάρων πάτηρ·
[ ]ολον ἀγροτέραν θέο̣ι
[ ].σιν ἐπωνύμιον μέγα·
[ ]ερος οὐδάμα πίλναται·
[ ].[.]. . . .α̣φόβε[. .]΄.ω·[5]

They translated the "general sense" as follows:

[… Apollo] whom Coeus'
[daughter] bore [in union with] Cronus' son, whose name is great. [But
Artemis] swore a great oath: ['] for ever virgin I shall be [ ] on
the peaks of the mountains [ ] assent for my sake.' [ ] the father of the
blessed gods [assented]. The gods [call her the Deer-]shooter, Goddess of the
Wilds [ ] a great title [ ]. The Love-god(?) approaches her not
at all. . . .[6]

Not long after, in his *Sappho and Alcaeus*, Page included the fragment in his discussion of Alcaeus' hymns, writing, "There is no evidence that Sappho wrote poems of this general type, whereas it is known that Alcaeus did so."[7] Page then restored the fragment and translated it, including a commentary:

Φοίβωι χρυψοκό]μ̣αι τόν ἔτικτε Κόω κ̣[όρα
μίγεισ᾽ ἰψινέφει Κρ]ονίδαι μεγαλωνύμωι.
Ἄρτεμις δέ θέων] μέγαν ὄρκον ἀπώμοσε·
νὴ τὰν σὰν κεφά]λαν ἄι πάρθενος ἔσσομαι
ἄδμης, οἰοπό]λ̣ων ὀρέων κορύφαισ᾽ ἔπι
θηρεύοισ᾽· ἄγι καὶ τά]δε νεῦσον ἔμαν χάριν.
ὣς εἶπ· αὐτὰρ ἔνευ]σε θέων μακάρων πάτηρ·
πάρθενον δ᾽ ἐλαφάβ]ολον ἀγροτέραν θέοι
ἄνθρωποί τε κάλει]σιν ἐπωνύμιον μέγα·
κήναι λυσιμέλης] Ἔρος οὐδάμα πίλαντι …

5 Lobel and Page (1952) 2.
6 Lobel and Page (1952) 2.
7 Page (1955) 261.

> … Phoebus of the golden hair, whom the daughter of Coeus bore, having lain with him who dwells in the clouds above, the son of Cronus whose name is great. But Artemis swore the great oath of the gods: 'By thy head I vow, for ever virgin I shall be, a huntress on the peaks of lonely mountains; come, grant these favours for my sake.' So she spoke; and the father of the blessed gods nodded assent. So gods and mortals call the maiden the Deer-slayer, the Spirit of the Wilds, a great title of honour. Love, who loosens the limbs, comes never nigh to her …[8]

The favored author of the fragment soon became Sappho, however, especially following the argument of Max Treu.[9] Based partially on style, Treu's main argument involves evidence from an anecdote from Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, in which Apollonius discusses a Pamphylian woman who wrote hymns to Artemis and had a connection to Sappho.[10] The lack of any other evidence concerning this woman's existence, however, has led scholars to conclude that this woman is Philostratus' invention.[11]

Nevertheless, from Treu on the fragment has been usually assigned to Sappho as fragment 44a, often with little or no discussion. This is the case in Voigt's *Sappho et Alcaeus* and David Campbell's *Greek Lyric* Loeb. So pervasive is this assignment that Alcaeus 304 is even absent from Gauthier Liberman's 1999 Budé, as he finds the previous arguments of Treu and G.M. Kirkwood persuasive. Kirkwood argues for Sappho's authorship based on the second column of the papyrus containing the fragment, which is likely not from the same poem and not necessarily by the same author.[12] I agree with the early uncertainty expressed by Lobel and Page that, "the choice between the two cannot be made on the evidence available,"[13] but there are broader reasons why the authorship matters. Not only has this fragment been used to support arguments about Sappho's life, songs, and "circle," but it also has been thrown into the vague category of Aeolic hymns without consideration of whether such a category

8 Page (1955) 261–262.

9 Treu (1963) 161–164.

10 Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 30.15.

11 Ewen Bowie calls her "surely bogus" (1994) 188. Claude Calame calls this account "probably not very reliable" (1977) 213.

12 Kirkwood (1974) 146.

13 Lobel and Page (1952) 3.

is even appropriate, or how the known examples of Aeolic hymns—both Sappho's and Alcaeus'—fit into hymnic genres.

Critical Stereotypes and Sappho's Circle

While the papyrus containing this Aeolic Hymn to Artemis as we know it now was published by Page and Lobel in 1952, three excerpted words were known as early as 1835 from an anonymous quotation in the Homeric *epimerismoi*:[14] ἀεὶ παρθένος ἔσομαι, "I will always be a *parthenos*."[15] This Αἰολεὺς τριχῶς, as it was called, was cited as an example of the way the word ἀεί, "always," functions in the Aeolic dialect.

The quotation is possibly mentioned once more in the scholia-*epimerismoi* again under discussion of ἀεί, but this time the single word ἀειπάρθενος appears in a list of compound words beginning with ἀεί, showing how the epsilon-iota diphthong is always written in these always-compounds with the exception of ἀΐδιος (eternal). More to the point, in the ensuing discussion of the Aeolic forms of the word ἀεί, that is, αἰΐ and ἄι, we read, δεῖ δὲ γινώσκειν ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἀειπάρθενος διὰ τῆς ει διφθόγγου γράφεται κοινῶς, Αἰολικῶς δὲ διὰ τοῦ ι ("one should know that ἀειπάρθενος is written with the epsilon-iota diphthong in koine but in the Aeolic dialect with the iota").[16]

With that information our ἀεὶ παρθένος ἔσομαι became ἀϊπάρθενος ἔσομαι and found an author. Bergk's 1866 *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* puts the fragment further into the Aeolic dialect—adding a double sigma to the verb—and prints it among Sappho's *epithalamia*: ἀϊπάρθενος ἔσσομαι. Edmond's 1934 *Greek Lyric*

14 The *epimerismoi*—sometimes translated as "Homeric parsings" (e.g. Race [1997] 381)—are Byzantine compilations of grammatical discussions of Homeric vocabulary. J.A. Cramer published the *epimerismoi* from two manuscripts, one containing "scholia-*epimerismoi*," which discusses words in the order they appear in the text and the other with *epimerismoi* listed in alphabetical order by the first letter. Cf. Dyck 8–14; the scholia-*epimerismoi* are from Coislinianus 387 (*Anecdota Parisiensia*. Oxford. 1841. iii: 294–370); The alphabetical are from Nov. Coll. 298 (*Anecdota Oxoniensia i*. Oxford. 1835).

15 The Greek word παρθένος likely designates an unmarried woman, and not a virgin in the modern conception of the word (cf. Calame [1977] 65), although Sissa (1990) discusses the semantic meaning of the word at length and comes down saying "there can be no doubt that virginity was a sexual, not a sociological, matter" (104). It is a complicated question, and for that reason I write "*parthenos*," which is at least free from the Christian overtones of "virgin."

16 *Epimerismoi Homerou*. Anec. Par. 3.321. Dyck, Vol. 1. 125–126 52 B.

Loeb follows Bergk's identification, placing it in Sappho's ninth book, the *epithalamia* again, and translating it "I shall be ever-maiden."[17] Lobel's 1925 edition of Sappho's songs follows Bergk's emendation as well, although the fragment is placed in the *incerti libri*. When we compare Bergk's version to the original quotation above, not only is there a difference in dialect, but the Aeolic τριχῶς has become an Aeolic διχῶς.[18]

Aeolic forms appear in many different types of works attributed to many different authors, but we only have the remains of two named Lesbian poets: Sappho and Alcaeus, both of whom are cited elsewhere in the *epimerismoi* by name. If we find ourselves deciding between the two, it is understandably much easier to imagine Sappho, a woman, making declarations about perpetual *partheneia* than Alcaeus. This connection becomes stronger when we compare this fragment to other Sapphic fragments that mention virginity such as fragment 114 V, in which a bride has a conversation with her *partheneia*:

> (νύμφη). παρθενία, παρθενία, ποῖ με λίποισ' ἀ⟨π⟩οίχῃ;
> (παρθενία). †οὐκέτι ἥξω πρὸς σέ, οὐκέτι ἥξω†.
>
> Bride: *Partheneia, partheneia*, where are you going, leaving me?
> *Partheneia*: Not ever will I come to you, not ever will I come.

C.M. Bowra's 1936 *Greek Lyric Poetry* further compares fragment 114 V, the conversation between bride and virginity, and ἀϊπάρθενος ἔσσομαι: "the words ἀϊπάρθενος ἔσσομαι, I shall always be a maiden, are more easily understood if they come from a song where a bride protests that she will not give up her maidenhood than if they come from a personal poem of Sappho, who was a wife and a mother. But for this interesting type of song the evidence is scanty, and we must wait for new discoveries."[19]

Especially after Mary Lefkowitz' *Lives of the Greek Poets*, modern scholars tend to balk at this sort of biographical fallacy, yet as Lefkowitz has argued elsewhere, stereotypes about women's poetry and what it should look like have long guided the interpretation and criticism of Sappho's corpus.[20] She argues that biographical criticism and societal assumptions about "normal" female psychology may lead us astray and cause us to misread and misunderstand

17 fr. 152.
18 Sappho *epithalamia* fr. 96: Bergk (1866); Sappho *epithalamia* fr. 152: Edmonds (1934); Sappho Incerti Libri 3: Lobel (1925).
19 Bowra (1936) 227.
20 Lefkowitz (1996).

poetry written by women. These preconceptions about the nature and content of Sappho's work clearly contributed to the identification of the three words ἀεὶ παρθένος ἔσομαι, whose frequent placement in Sappho's book of *epithalamia* further highlights this scholarly bias, even though some scholars placed it in the *incerti libri*. Even now that we have a larger fragment and the instructive mistakes of our predecessors, these critical stereotypes persevere.

As I mentioned above, Alcaeus 304/Sappho 44a has become part of a basis from which to speak about the possible social circle or age of the performers of Sappho's songs. Lyn Hatherly Wilson's discussion of virginity and this fragment in particular is a case in point:

> By resisting marriage, or by remaining virginal and therefore being positioned in a marginal space outside the usual processes of exchange and male dominance, Artemis—and the women of the Sapphic community—do have some freedom. Perhaps this broken song is not just pro 'virginity', but is also against marriage and the subordination of women in heterosexual relationships.[21]

In the same vein, Anne Burnett calls Artemis a "divine model" for the girls in Sappho's "circle." She writes, "Virginity was of supreme importance and yet Sappho's maids, unlike Artemis, were not to spend their lives in the wilds, but were to enter luxurious households as brides."[22] Andre Lardinois more cautiously writes, "in fragment 44A the maidenhood for which Artemis prays may reflect the age of the young women who made up Sappho's choruses."[23] Among other things, the comparative evidence of Alcman's choral songs supports Lardinois' argument elsewhere that at least some of Sappho's songs were performed by choruses of young women and that her hymns in particular might have been chorally performed,[24] but I argue that this is not the case for this particular hymn, which was not written for choral performance, but rather is a narrative hymn much like those traditionally assigned to Alcaeus.

21 Wilson (1997) 91.

22 Burnett (1983) 218.

23 Lardinois (2001) 80.

24 Lardinois (1996). Other scholars support the possibility of choral performance: Calame (1994) 210 ff.; Nagy (2007).

Genres of Archaic Hymns

T.W. Allen divides all hymns into two groups: rhapsodic, also called hexameter hymns, and melic hymns.[25] This division is in different ways both too broad and too limiting, but these categories persist in scholarship (although sometimes they are termed rhapsodic vs. cultic or rhapsodic vs. cletic).[26] More frequently in recent scholarship, our so-called rhapsodic hymns are simply dismissed from the hymnic corpus as literary works.[27] Furley and Bremer define the difference between cult and literature, writing, "The cult hymn is a form of worship directed towards winning a god's goodwill and securing his or her assistance or favour. Literature is concerned with the entertainment and enlightenment of the audience addressed."[28] They omit the *Homeric Hymns* from their collection of hymns partly because they are not, in their view, "cult songs in any real sense."[29]

Even with hexameter hymns removed from the broader hymnic corpus, however, the status of some melic hymns is questioned. Among these are the hymns of Sappho and Alcaeus, which are often lumped together as symposiastic songs with an ambiguous connection to hymns and are frequently dismissed as merely literary. Furley and Bremer include them in their source book, but place them outside of the religious sphere, writing, "[they] have close affinities with religious hymns but [they] were probably not intended for performance in official cult."[30] If we look at the fragments themselves, however, it becomes clear that there is more than one type of Lesbian hymn: some are cletic and some are narrative. Moreover, this generic difference can distinguish the hymns attributed to Sappho and to Alcaeus.

---

25 Allen (1963) lxxxiii.

26 Race (1990), writing about hymnic forms in Pindar, uses the terms cultic and rhapsodic to differentiate the formal characteristics of different types of hymns. Since he is looking at the formal features of hymns within the epinician genre, however, he does not take into account the performance settings or occasion of unembedded hymns.

27 An important exception is Bouchon, Brillet-Dubois, and Le Meur-Weissman (2012).

28 Furley and Bremer (2001) 2.

29 Furley and Bremer (2001) 43.

30 Furley and Bremer (2001) 43.

Sappho's Cletic Hymns

In this particular case, time has been kinder to Sappho, to whom seven hymnic fragments—one even a complete hymn—are attributed as well as several other fragments which may or may not be from hymns.[31] Sappho 1, a hymn to Aphrodite, has by far received the most attention, perhaps because it is our only complete work under Sappho's name. It presents a full picture of the three characteristics of Sappho's hymnic genre: κλῆσις, a formal prayer, and first-person statements.[32]

This first characteristic, κλῆσις, from which cletic hymns take their name, is an invocation or summons to a god to be present. For example, Sappho 1 begins with an address to Aphrodite (ποικιλόθρον' ἀθανάτ' Ἀφρόδιτα, "Deathless Aphrodite of the ornamented throne," 1), before asking her to come in the second stanza (ἀλλὰ τυίδ' ἔλθ'. "But come here," 5). A κλῆσις is considered to be the mark of a cultic hymn and in fact, some scholars use the terms cultic and cletic interchangeably. Despite the disagreements about the purpose and occasion of Sappho's hymns, Sappho 1 is often cited as the classic example of a cletic hymn. Even in antiquity, Sappho's hymns were an example of this

---

31 There is no standard corpus of Sappho's hymns. I include fragments 1, 2, 5, 17, 33, 86, and 140 in the corpus of hymns. It should be noted that 83, 127 LP and 128 LP contain a κλῆσις, but only single lines are preserved: To the Graces 83: βροδοπάχεες ἄγναι Χάριτες δεῦτε Δίος κόραι (Rosy-armed holy Graces, come here, daughters of Zeus). To the Muses 127 LP: δεῦρο δηὖτε Μοῖσαι χρύσιον λίποισαι (Come here again Muses, leaving golden …). To the Graces and the Muses 128 LP: δεῦτέ νυν ἄβραι Χάριτες καλλίκομοί τε Μοῖσαι (Come here delicate Graces and lovely-tressed Muses). 9 LP might contain the name Hera, but is too fragmentary to determine its content or genre. 15 LP addresses Aphrodite: Κύ]πρι (9), but not enough is preserved to make the context clear. 40 LP speaks of a sacrifice, but the context is impossible to determine and could equally be in a mythological song rather than a hymn. 3 LP seems to be written for a Pannychis or all-night festival (ἄγχι γὰρ ἀμέρα. For day is near 5). 54 LP describes Eros, but again, the context could be mythological. 73 LP and 86 LP contain Aphrodite's name, but the context is unclear. 84 LP contains the name "Artemis," but not much else. 99b seems to be hymn to Apollo, but the reading is very uncertain and the fragment has also been attributed to Alcaeus (Alc. 303a V). Athenaeus tells us that 101 LP is Sappho addressing Aphrodite, making it likely from a hymn, but we cannot be sure. Lardinois (2001) 76 includes more fragments in his list as well as some testimonia. I have omitted testimonia as well as several fragments without clear context.

32 Compare this discussion of Sappho's hymns with the chapter of Raschieri and Pitotto (Ch. 13), where hymnic structure in Sappho is a matter of the "framing" of a Sappho poem to set it up as Sappho in a performance context.

particular characteristic. Menander Rhetor, who divides hymns based on their formal characteristics, writes that the majority of Sappho's hymns are cletic, κλητικοί:

> κλητικοὶ μὲν οὖν ὁποῖοί εἰσιν οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν τε παρὰ τῇ Σαπφοῖ ἢ Ἀνακρέοντι ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις μελικοῖς, κλῆσιν ἔχοντες πολλῶν θεῶν.
>
> Cletic hymns are such as the majority of those by Sappho or Anacreon or the other melic poets, and they have a κλῆσις, a call for many gods.[33]

The κλῆσις is marked by an address to the god (e.g., χρυσοστέφαν' Ἀφρόδιτα 33 LP), a word designating space or location (e.g., δεῦρύ in 2 LP and πλάσιον in 17 LP), and an imperative verb—often a verb of motion (e.g. ἔλθε, 1.25) or a form of φαίνω (φανείη, 17 LP).

The second characteristic, a prayer, is a little more complicated since the distinction between a hymn and a prayer is often blurred. Here, I use the word prayer to describe a formal device within a hymn: a request to a god. While a prayer may be interwoven with a κλῆσις—the act of asking a deity to be present is in itself a prayer for the presence of the god or goddess—it can also be separate. For instance, Sappho 5, now with a known *incipit*, contains a complex prayer for the safe return of the singer's brother:[34]

> Πότνιαι Νηρήιδες ἀβλάβη[ν μοι
> τὸν κασί]γνητον δ[ό]τε τυίδ' ἴκεσθα[ι
> κὤσσα ϝ]οι θύμῳ κε θέλῃ γένεσθαι
> πάντα τε]λέσθην,
>
> ὄσσα δὲ πρ]όσθ' ἄμβροτε πάντα λῦσαι
> καὶ φίλοισ]ι ϝοῖσι χάραν γένεσθαι
> κὠνίαν] ἔχθροισι, γένοιτο δ' ἄμμι
> πῆμ' ἔτι μ]ηδ' εἴς·
>
> SAPPHO 5V.1–8

33 Menander Rhetor, Διαίρεσις τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν 333.8–10.

34 Burris et al. (2014); Obbink (2014); (2015). The same papyrus discovery that revealed the "Brothers Poem" contained the previously unknown first word of fragment 5. Previously the prayer had been reconstructed to address Kypris and the Nereids.

Queen Nereids, grant that my brother,
unharmed, arrive here to me
and that as many things as he wishes in heart to happen
all are accomplished

and as many things he did wrong, grant that he makes up for it all
and may he be dear to his friends
and a grief to his enemies, and may he no longer be a sorrow for us.

The goddesses are clearly invoked and asked to insure an arrival, here not their own, but that of Sappho's brother. The requests themselves are traditional or perhaps even formulaic. For instance, the prayer in lines 3–4 is very similar to Aphrodite's question to Sappho in Sappho 1 (κὤττι μοι μάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι | μαινόλαι θύμωι· "⟨You asked⟩ what I especially was wishing to happen to me in my raging heart," 17–18) as well as the prayer at the end of Sappho 1 (ὄσσα δέ μοι τέλεσσαι | θῦμος ἰμέρρει, τέλεσον, "And as many things as my heart desires to accomplish, do them," 26–27). The request in lines 6–7 is very similar to Solon's prayer in his cletic hymn to the Muses: δότε … εἶναι δὲ γλυκὺν ὧδε φίλοις, ἐχθροῖσι δὲ πικρόν. "Grant that I be sweet to my friends and bitter to my enemies" (Sol. 13.3–5 W).

First-person statements, the third characteristic, occur in all Sappho's hymn fragments, but none of them preserve the same level of intimacy between singer and god that we find in Sappho 1.[35] There, the singer addresses the goddess with great frequency throughout the poem, referring to her in the second person in some way in every single line of the first nine lines. The description of Aphrodite's bird-drawn chariot takes up lines 10–12, before the singer returns to the goddess in line 13, calling her σὺ, "you." The singer is continuously emphatic about the fact that she is directly addressing the goddess. Indeed, their intimacy reaches such a point that the singer's report of Aphrodite's words seamlessly slips into direct speech until the goddess herself is speaking and directly addresses Sappho by name.

35 Fragments 134 and 159 contain conversations between Sappho and Aphrodite, but as far we can tell are not hymns. Sappho fr. 134 LP: ζά ⟨τ'⟩ ἐλεξάμαν ὄναρ, Κυπρογένη (I spoke with you, Kyprogenea, in a dream.) Sappho fr. 159 V (Maximus, *Dialexis* 18.9 G3–4) λέγει που καὶ Σαπφοῖ ἡ Ἀφροδίτη ἐν ᾄσματι: σύ τε κᾶμος θεράπων Ἔρος (Aphrodite perhaps also says to Sappho in a song: "You and my attendant Eros.") Fr. 124 αὔτα δὲ σὺ Καλλιόπα (and you yourself, Calliope), directly addresses one of the Muses, but again, it is unclear whether this is hymnic.

Scholars have traditionally looked at this semblance of intimacy as a sign that this is one of Sappho's solo or private songs, although there is some disagreement.[36] I am sympathetic to the argument for choral performance of Sappho's songs, but I argue that regardless of the performance setting the formal features κλῆσις, prayer, and first-person statements are generic characteristics of Sapphic hymns. With the clear exception of the fragmentary Adonis song, which is a call-and-response or perhaps a dialogue,[37] these characteristics consistently appear in Sappho's other hymn fragments. More importantly, while Sappho's hymns might contain descriptive passages like the description of the locus amoenus in 2 LP or the goddess' trip from Olympos to the singer's side in Sappho 1, they do not tell stories about the mythological exploits of the gods whom they are addressing. That is, they do not contain an extended narrative. The majority of Alcaeus' hymns, on the other hand, seem to be impersonal narrative hymns.[38]

---

36 Lardinois (1996) 153 points to Sappho 1 as an example of a song that was more likely sung by Sappho herself, but argues for the choral performance of Sappho 2 LP, 17 LP, and 140 V, and at least public performance for 5 LP. Snyder (1991) 3 argues that Sappho's songs cover a range of public and private occasions, and that fragment 1 seems "in some way connected with familiar rituals of a public character" and is "written in imitation of the standard form of Greek prayer," although she views Sappho as a solo performer. Gregory Nagy (2007) 16 has argued for the choral performance of Sappho's songs: "In the songs of Sappho, the 'I' may represent a lead singer who can speak directly to a presiding divinity on behalf of the whole *khoros*, as we see in Song 1 of Sappho. Further, the 'I' may also represent that divinity speaking back to the lead singer and, by extension, to the whole group attending and participating in the performance of the song. Within the framework of that song, the lead singer becomes identified with Aphrodite by virtue of performing as the prima donna of a *khoros*. And there are also many other roles played out by the speaking 'I' in the songs of Sappho. For example the 'I' may be Sappho speaking in the first person to a bride or to a bridegroom in the second person—or about them in the third person." Nagy has argued elsewhere that even if a song is monodic, the first-person "I" in Sappho's songs act as a khoregos and "presuppose or represent an interaction, offstage, as it were, with a choral aggregate." (Nagy [1990] 371; [1996] 87). Calame (1977) 367–372; (1997) 210–214 has pointed to the similarities between the information we have from Sappho's songs about choreography and musical activity and what we know to have been characteristic of female choruses.

37 Κατθνάσκει, Κυθέρη', ἄβρος Ἄδωνις· τί κε θεῖμεν; / καττύπτεσθε, κόραι, καὶ κατερείκεσθε κίθωνας. (Graceful Adonis dies, Kytherea! What should we do? / Beat your breasts, girls, and shred your dress! Sappho 140V).

38 There are two hymns, to Eros and Athena respectively, which are too fragmentary to determine whether or not they fit into this type of narrative hymn. The hymn to Eros contains a genealogy of the god, which fits into the conventions of narrative hymns: …

Alcaeus' Narrative Hymns

By a narrative hymn, I mean a hymn whose main feature is a narrative story about the god to whom the hymn is addressed. The best-known examples of this type are the major *Homeric Hymns* and the six hexameter hymns of Callimachus, but I argue that Alcaeus' hymns belong in this category as well.[39] These fit into Menander Rhetor's categories of γενεαλογικοί or μυθικοί ὕμνοι. Indeed, he uses Alcaeus as an example of an author of genealogical hymns:

> καὶ ἤδη τινὲς καὶ Διονύσου γονὰς ὕμνησαν, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος ἕτεροι, καὶ Ἀλκαῖος Ἡφαίστου καὶ πάλιν Ἑρμοῦ …
>
> And some have sung the birth of Dionysus and others Apollo, and Alcaeus of the birth of Hephaestus and again of Hermes …[40]

δεινότατον θέων, / ⟨τὸν⟩ γέννατ' εὐπέδιλλος Ἶρις / χρυσοκόμᾳ Ζεφύρῳ μίγεισα (Most terrible of gods, whom Iris with pretty sandals bore mixing with golden-haired Zephyrus … fr. 327). The hymn to Athena is less certain, only describing the goddess in her role as protector of Coroneia: Ὤνασσ' Ἀθανάα πολεμάδοκε / ἅ ποι Κορωνήας μεδ[/ναύω πάροιθεν ἀμφι[.......] / Κωραλίω ποτάμω πὰρ ὄχθαις (Lady Athena, war-sustaining, who rules over Coroneia before the temple around … by the banks of the river Coralios. fr. 325). Ewen Bowie (2009) 118–122 argues these hymns point to Alcaeus' travels to Boiotia. In general, Eros did not have many temples or attract much worship, so the existence of a major cult of Eros at Thespiae possibly speaks to a Boiotian setting and the hymn to Athena has a clear Boiotian focus, beginning with Coroneia. Bowie also discusses a possible hymn to the river Hebrus (fr. 45), which I do not include here, since there is no actual request or prayer signifying it to be a hymn, nor the description of the river's birth or ancestry or a mythological narrative. The specific locality in these hymns is markedly different from the broader outlook of most of the *Homeric Hymns*. *Homeric Hymn* 9 to Artemis, however, defies this pattern with a focus on one geographic area: Anatolia. Allen (1904) 241 writes: "the marks of locality (the Meles, Smyrna, and Claros) are not of sufficiently PanHellenic importance to be merely 'literary,' as would be, for example, the mention of Cyprus and Cythera in connexion with Aphrodite." Despite its specific geographical focus, the structure of this hymn is parallel to that of other *Homeric Hymns*, suggesting some hymns could have a regional focal point. To give another example, *Homeric Hymn* 21 to *Apollo*—though it does not delve into the same kind of detail as the Artemis-hymn—focuses on the river Peneus in Thessaly. The major *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* might also be tied closely to Eleusis, etc.

39 Richardson (2015) discusses the narrative structure of the *Homeric Hymns*.

40 Menander Rhetor, Διαίρεσις τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν 340.13–15.

For an example of a narrative hymn by Alcaeus, I turn to his hymn to Apollo (307a LP), which begins ὦναξ Ἄπολλον, παῖ μεγάλω Δίος, "Lord Apollo, son of mighty Zeus." Only this first line has survived intact,[41] but we are very fortunate to have a prose summary by the late-antique sophist Himerius, which sketches out the plot of the hymn, along with a few details.[42] From this summary we learn that when Apollo was born Zeus equipped him with a mitre, lyre, and a chariot drawn by swans and sent him to Delphi to decree justice and right for the Greeks (δίκη καὶ θέμις). Instead, Apollo flew up to the land of Hyperboreans, where he stayed for a year until the prayers and songs of the Delphians convinced him to fly south.

Discussing this song, Page writes, "The Apollo whom Alcaeus celebrates is not his own Apollo, but a stranger to the cult of his native land and neighbourhood. This hymn is, then, evidence of a breadth of outlook and interest which is not known to have been common in that place at that era."[43] Just as we find in the *Homeric Hymns*, the focus of the hymn is on the story, the narrative, rather than the connection made between the performer and the god.

I would like to suggest then, that the tradition of hymns in which Alcaeus wrote and to which Alcaeus' hymn to Apollo belongs is related to the tradition of *Homeric Hymns*. Due to its narrative content, Alcaeus 304 or Sappho 44a—regardless of its nomenclature—belongs to this tradition of narrative hymns. To show this, I turn to the connections between Alcaeus' hymns and the *Homeric Hymns* before looking at Alcaeus 304/Sappho 44a more closely in relation to other hymns, but especially the major *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*.

Alcaeus' hymn to Apollo was placed first in the Alexandrian collection of his works followed by a hymn to Hermes:

Χαῖρε, Κυλλάνας ὀ μέδεις, σὲ γάρ μοι
θῦμος ὔμνην, τὸν κορύφαισ' ἐν αὔταις
Μαῖα γέννατο Κρονίδαι μίγεισα
Παμβασίληϊ

ALCAEUS fr. 308 V

Hail guardian of Cyllene,
for my heart wishes to sing you,

41 Edmonds (1934) 318–321 gives a very interesting reconstruction of what the hymn might have looked like.

42 Himerius, *Oration* 48.109.

43 Page (1955) 247.

whom on the hilltops Maia bore mixing in love
with the son of Kronos, ruler of all.

Although only four lines remain, his hymn to Hermes contains clear parallels to the beginnings of both *Homeric Hymns* to Hermes (*Homeric Hymns* 4 and 18).[44] All three hymns begin with the god's origin, the story of his mother's covert dalliance with Zeus, as well as an epithet mentioning a place sacred to him: Cyllene.[45] The χαῖρε with which Alcaeus begins is further parallel to the χαῖρε prayers at the ends of both *Homeric Hymns* to Hermes (4.578, 18.12) as well as many other *Homeric Hymns*.

While the hymn to Hermes has no prose summary, we do have other scattered information about the hymn's narrative content. Pausanias tells us that in Alcaeus' hymn to Hermes, Hermes stole Apollo's cattle, which makes the plot seem quite similar to the plot of the *Homeric Hymn*.[46] If the added detail in Horace *Odes* 1.10—that Hermes stole Apollo's quiver as well—is really *ab Alcaeo lyrico poeta*, the hymns are even more in tune with each other.[47] In lines 514–515 of the major *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* Apollo expresses his anxiety that Hermes' theft will extend well past his cattle:

44 Cf. Vergados (2012) 76–77; Richardson (2010) 25; Morrison (2007) 82 suggests that Alcaeus "may be deliberately varying the Homeric model."

45 In the shorter *Homeric Hymn* (18), like Alcaeus' hymn there is no Muse invocation; the singer begins the hymn. Nagy has argued that the two *Homeric Hymns* to Hermes are examples of expansion and compression in oral poetics, resulting in different versions of the same hymn suitable for varying circumstances of performance, Nagy (1982) 54. Commanding the Muse to sing and starting to sing in the first person seem interchangeable at the beginning of these types of hymns. Vergados' commentary (2012) discusses the differences between the opening of 4 and 18.

46 Pausanias 7.20.4: βουσὶ γὰρ χαίρειν μάλιστα Ἀπόλλωνα Ἀλκαῖός τε ἐδήλωσεν ἐν ὕμνῳ τῷ ἐς Ἑρμῆν, γράψας ὡς ὁ Ἑρμῆς βοῦς ὑφέλοιτο τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, καὶ ἔτι πρότερον ἢ Ἀλκαῖον γενέσθαι πεποιημένα ἦν Ὁμήρῳ βοῦς Ἀπόλλωνα Λαομέδοντος ἐπὶ μισθῷ νέμειν· (In the hymn to Hermes, Alcaeus made clear that Apollo especially rejoices in cattle, writing how Hermes stole the cattle of Apollo, and still earlier than Alcaeus, Homer made Apollo herd the cattle of Laomedon for a requital.)

47 The scholiast Porphyrion connects Horace's ode to Alcaeus. (Holder (1967) 16–17). Also on this stanza Porphyrion writes: *Fabula haec atem ab Alcaeo ficta*. (This story, however, was created by Alcaeus.) Horace *Odes* 1.10.9–12: *Te, boues olim nisi reddidisses | per dolum amotas, puerum minaci | uoce dum terret, uiduus pharetra | risit Apollo*. (Once upon a time Apollo, bereft of his quiver, laughed while he frightened you, a boy, with a threatening voice unless you returned his cattle, filched through a trick.)

Δείδια Μαιάδος υἱὲ διάκτορε ποικιλομῆτα
μή μοι ἀνακλέψῃς κίθαριν καὶ καμπύλα τόξα·
τιμὴν γὰρ πὰρ Ζηνὸς ἔχεις ἐπαμοίβιμα ἔργα
θήσειν ἀνθρώποισι κατὰ χθόνα πουλυβότειραν.
H.H. Hermes 514–517

I fear, son of Maia, messenger with variegated *mētis*,
that you may steal back my kithara and my curved bow.
For you have this *timē* from Zeus, to make acts of exchange
for men throughout the much-nourishing earth.

In the *Homeric Hymn*, it is not only Hermes' nature, but his Zeus-granted right to exchange goods—with or without permission. In Alcaeus' hymn, Hermes was living up to this panhellenic reputation through his theft of Apollo's cattle and possibly his quiver as well.

Five of Alcaeus' fragments have been attributed to a hymn to Dionysus, or, omitting the first (Ἐρραφέωτ', οὐ γὰρ ἄναξ. Bull god, for not, lord; 349a V), to Hephaestus.[48] Menander Rhetor contributes to the latter attribution with his mention of a hymn on the birth of Hephaestus (see above), but the content of the fragments suggests the hymn's narrative told the story of the return of Hephaestus, which points to Dionysus as honoree.[49]

Martin West has reconstructed the fragmentary *Homeric Hymn* 1 to Dionysus, arguing that it tells of Hephaestus' expulsion from and return to Olympos.[50] That is, Hephaestus sends Hera a trick chair in revenge for his expulsion from Olympos. The chair holds her prisoner once she sits in it and only he has the knowledge to release her. One by one the gods try to bring Hephaestus back, but none prevail until Dionysus gets him drunk and leads him home on a don-

48 The epithet Ἐρραφέωτ is also found in the *Homeric Hymn* (there, εἰραφιῶτα; 15).

49 349b V speaks of the trap Hephaestus devises for Hera: … ὤστε θέων μηδ' ἔν' Ὀλυμπίων / λῦσ' ἄτερ ϝέθεν … (so that none of the Olympian gods could release her except for him …). 349c V preserves Ares' boast that he will be able to retrieve Hephaestus: … ὀ δ' Ἄρευς φαῖσί κεν Ἄφαιστον ἄγην βίαι (And Ares says he could bring back Hephaestus by force). The last two fragments' connection to the hymn are the most tenuous. 349e V, εἶς τῶν δυοκαιδέκων (one of the twelve), might reflect the promise to Dionysus that he will be made one of the Olympians in exchange for his service. 349c V, γέλαν δ' ἀθάνατοι θέοι (and the deathless gods laughed), has been associated with the hymn mainly due to its similarity to the end of *Iliad* 1 when the gods laugh at Hephaestus' wobbly cup-bearing.

50 West (2001); (2011).

key, a scene that is the subject of many vase paintings. If Alcaeus' hymn told this same story, it is likely that it was also dedicated to Dionysus. Still, it quite possibly was dedicated to Hephaestus, perhaps praising him for teaching skills and crafts to men, just as he is praised in his eight-line *Homeric Hymn*, which lacks a larger narrative.[51]

Alcaeus' three hymns to Apollo, Hermes, and Dionysus (or Hephaestus) have clear verbal and thematic parallels to *Homeric Hymns* and contain narratives about the gods. Two other hymns attributed to Alcaeus, 129 LP and 34 LP, however, have marked similarities with Sappho's hymns and warrant special attention.

Fragment 129 LP addresses Zeus, Hera, and Dionysus, the same three gods as Sappho's 17 LP. This might reflect local Mytilenean cult, showing a regional perspective. On the other hand, the political invective in this fragment directed against Pittacus the Potbelly (φύσγων) perhaps indicates that this song is closer to Alcaeus' other political songs and is not truly hymnic, but simply contains a prayer.[52]

Alcaeus 34 LP, a hymn to the Dioskouroi, is similar in content to *Homeric Hymn* 33 to the Dioskouroi,[53] but begins with a κλῆσις, which brings it closer in style to Sappho's cletic hymns:

> νᾶ]σον Πέλοπος λίποντε[ς
> [ ]ιμο̣ Δ[ίος] ἠδὲ Λήδας
> .....ω]ι θύ[μ]ῳ προ[φά]νητε, Κάστορ
> καὶ Πολύδε[υ]κες,
> οἲ κὰτ εὔρηαν χ[θόνα] καὶ θάλασσαν
> παῖσαν ἔρχεσθ' ὠ[κυπό]δων ἐπ' ἴππων,
> ῥῆα δ' ἀνθρώποι[ς] θα[ν]άτω ῥύεσθε
> ζακρυόεντος
> εὐσ̣δ[ύγ]ων θρώισκοντ[ες..] ἄκρα νάων
> π]ήλοθεν λάμπροι προ̣[ ]τρ̣[....]ντες,
> ἀργαλέαι δ' ἐν νύκτι φ[άος φέ]ροντες
> νᾶϊ μ[ε]λαίνᾳ·
> [ ]υε[
> [ ]ο̣σ

---

51 *Homeric Hymn* 20.

52 Cf. Demosthenes' *De Corona*, which begins with a prayer to the gods, but this does not mark the speech as a prose hymn.

53 Cf. West (2002) 216; Alcaeus 34a LP might be another hymn to the Dioskouroi.

> Leaving the island of Pelops,
> of Zeus and Leda,
> appear to my heart Castor
> and Polydeuces
> who, over the broad earth and beating sea,
> you go on swift-footed horses,
> easily you rescue men from chill death
> leaping over the tops of well-benched ships
> bright from far off …
> bearing light to the troubled night
> to the black ship …

The singer in Alcaeus 34 LP prays for the twins' help during a storm at sea, describing the comfort their divine light in the sky (St. Elmo's fire) brings to men in distress.

In the *Homeric Hymn*, the twins are saviors of men and ships when stormy blasts rush over the ungentle sea: σωτῆρας … παῖδας ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων| ὠκυπόρων τε νεῶν, ὅτε τε σπέρχωσιν ἄελλαι / χειμέριαι κατὰ πόντον ἀμείλιχον (6–8). Here, however, St. Elmo's fire is imagined as an epiphany of the gods themselves:

> οἱ δ' ἐξαπίνης ἐφάνησαν
> ξουθῇσι πτερύγεσσι δι' αἰθέρος ἀΐξαντες,
> αὐτίκα δ' ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων κατέπαυσαν ἀέλλας,
> κύματα δ' ἐστόρεσαν λευκῆς ἁλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι,
> ναύταις σήματα καλὰ πόνου σφίσιν· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες
> γήθησαν, παύσαντο δ' ὀϊζυροῖο πόνοιο.
>
> *Homeric Hymn* 33.12–17

> They suddenly appear
> darting through the air with swift wings,
> and immediately they stop the blasts of the troubled winds,
> and smooth the waves of the white brine in the sea,
> lovely signs for sailors and their toil.
> And seeing them, they rejoice
> and cease from their harsh toil.

Both the *Homeric Hymn* and the fragment of Alcaeus' hymn to the Dioskouroi are more descriptive than narrative, since they do not contain a story about the deeds of Castor and Polydeuces. In the Hellenistic Period, however, Theocritus

wrote a complex hymn to the Dioskouroi beginning with description before telling a story about each twin (*Idyll* 22). Theocritus' hymn clearly alludes to both these earlier hymns and so shows an ongoing interest in the hymnic tradition surrounding the Dioskouroi. Perhaps we can interpret the extended narratives in Theocritus as an indication that he also associated the Homeric and Alcaeic hymn traditions with narrative.

Page describes Alcaeus' hymns, writing "These Lesbian Hymns resemble the Homeric Hymns inasmuch as the attributes and adventures of divine persons are their principal themes, and inasmuch as they appear rather to be literary exercises, designed for the entertainment of an audience on more or less informal occasions, than devotional cult-songs, designed for presentation as acts of worship. But this general resemblance is less interesting than the differences."[54] I hope to have shown that there is more than a general resemblance, in fact, there is a generic one. Both Alcaeus' hymns and the *Homeric Hymns* are narrative hymns, whose focus is on the telling of mythological stories about the gods rather than asking them for their presence or aid.[55]

Alcaeus 304/Sappho 44a in Context

In the Byzantine period when the editors of the Homeric *epimerismoi* first cited the three-word quotation ἀεὶ παρθένος ἔσομαι, the compound word ἀειπάρθενος would have been quite well known, used frequently to describe the Christian Virgin Mary.[56] Before that, Cassius Dio used it to describe the Vestal Virgins[57] and in Philo and other Pythagorean writings, it represents the prime number seven, since it is neither a factor nor a multiple of the numbers one through

54 Page (1955) 244.

55 The *Homeric Hymns* frequently end with a prayer to the god or goddess, but often the gods are simply bid χαῖρε e.g. *Homeric Hymn* 4 to Hermes, *Homeric Hymn* 5 to Aphrodite; *Homeric Hymn* 7 to Dionysus, *Homeric Hymn* 9 to Artemis, etc. Other times, the prayer is specific to the performance, e.g. *Homeric Hymn* 10 to Aphrodite: δὸς δ' ἱμερόεσσαν ἀοιδήν (give me a lovely song 5); *Homeric Hymn* 24 to Hestia: χάριν δ' ἅμ' ὄπασσον ἀοιδῇ (grant grace to my song 5). There are some other broad, general prayers: e.g., *Homeric Hymn* 11 to Athena χαῖρε, θεά, δὸς δ' ἄμμι τύχην εὐδαιμονίην τε. (Hail, goddess, and give us fortune and happiness 5); *Homeric Hymn* 13 to Demeter: χαῖρε, θεά, καὶ τήνδε σάου πόλιν, ἄρχε δ' ἀοιδῆς. (Hail goddess and protect our city and guide our song 3). Even in the latter examples I find a difference between these prayers and a κλῆσις, which calls on the gods to actually come and be present.

56 e.g., Gregory of Nyssa, *In anuntiationem* 96; Athanasius *Testimonia e scriptura* 28.77.13.

57 e.g., Cassius Dio, *Historiae Romanae* 37.34.4.2, 42.32.1.1.

ten.[58] We have no other attestations of the word before the first century BCE, whether in its Aeolic form or otherwise, but we do have other attestations of the concept of perpetual *partheneia*.

Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* begins with the goddess sitting on her father's knee and asking for a slew of honors, one of which is a παρθενίην αἰώνιον, a lifelong *partheneia*:

> Ἄρτεμιν (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαφρὸν ἀειδόντεσσι λαθέσθαι)
> ὑμνέομεν, τῇ τόξα λαγωβολίαι τε μέλονται
> καὶ χορὸς ἀμφιλαφὴς καὶ ἐν οὔρεσιν ἑψιάασθαι,
> ἄρχμενοι ὡς ὅτε πατρὸς ἐφεζομένη γονάτεσσι
> παῖς ἔτι κουρίζουσα τάδε προσέειπε γονῆα·
> '**δός μοι παρθενίην αἰώνιον**, ἄππα, φυλάσσειν,
> καὶ πολυωνυμίην, ἵνα μή μοι Φοῖβος ἐρίζῃ,
> δὸς δ' ἰοὺς καὶ τόξα …'
>
> CALL., *Hymn to Artemis* 1–8

> Of Artemis (for it is not a light thing for those singing to forget her)
> we sing, for whom the bow and hare-catching are a care
> and the wide-spread chorus and haunting the mountains,
> starting from when as a child sitting on her father's knees,
> still being a *koura* she spoke these words to her parent,
> "*Give me a lifelong* ***partheneia***, Daddy, to guard,
> and many names, so Phoebus doesn't vie with me,
> and give me arrows and a bow …"

Scholars have long recognized this demand as a clear allusion to Artemis' declaration in Alcaeus 304/Sappho 44a, but—as is often the case with Hellenistic poetry—the allusion is complex and conglomerate. Callimachus incorporates elements from *Iliad* 21, where Artemis is also sitting on her father's knees as well as several of the *Homeric Hymns*. The list of honors which Artemis requests corresponds mostly to her traditional hymnic epithets in the two *Homeric Hymns* to Artemis and her description in the major *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, but it also reflects the description of another goddess in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*: Hestia.

The *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* begins describing the goddess' nearly unlimited power over gods, men, and all living things, but then turns to the

58 e.g., Philo, *Legum allegoriam* 1.15.5; *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* 170.4.

three virgin goddesses that Aphrodite cannot control: Athena, Artemis, and Hestia. The treatment of Athena and Artemis is brief and largely in keeping with their *Homeric Hymns*, but the mini-hymn to Hestia contains a complete narrative about a goddess who generally lacks mythology, even giving her the longest treatment of the three:

> οὐδὲ μὲν αἰδοίῃ κούρῃ ἄδεν ἔργ' Ἀφροδίτης
> Ἱστίῃ, ἣν πρώτην τέκετο Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης,
> αὖτις δ' ὁπλοτάτην, βουλῇ Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,
> πότνιαν, ἣν ἐμνῶντο Ποσειδάων καὶ Ἀπόλλων·
> ἡ δὲ μάλ' οὐκ ἔθελεν ἀλλὰ στερεῶς ἀπέειπεν,
> **ὤμοσε δὲ μέγαν ὅρκον**, ὃ δὴ τετελεσμένος ἐστίν,
> ἁψαμένη κεφαλῆς πατρὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
> **παρθένος ἔσσεσθαι πάντ' ἤματα**, δῖα θεάων.
> τῇ δὲ πατὴρ Ζεὺς δῶκε καλὸν γέρας ἀντὶ γάμοιο,
> καί τε μέσῳ οἴκῳ κατ' ἄρ' ἕζετο πῖαρ ἑλοῦσα.
> πᾶσιν δ' ἐν νηοῖσι θεῶν τιμάοχός ἐστι
> καὶ παρὰ πᾶσι βροτοῖσι θεῶν πρέσβειρα τέτυκται.
> τάων οὐ δύναται πεπιθεῖν φρένας οὐδ' ἀπατῆσαι·
> *Homeric Hymn* 5.21–33

> Nor do the works of Aphrodite touch the revered maiden Hestia,
> whom cunning Kronos bore first,
> and then again last, by the plan of Aegis-bearing Zeus,
> the mistress whom Poseidon and Apollo wooed.
> But she was especially unwilling and she firmly said no,
> *and she swore a mighty oath*, which indeed was fulfilled,
> touching the head of Aegis-bearing Zeus, the father,
> *she swore to be a* ***parthenos*** *for all time*, divine goddess.
> And to her Zeus gave a great honor instead of marriage,
> and she sits in the middle of houses receiving the choicest part,
> and she is honored in every temple of the gods
> and she is the most revered of the gods among all mortals.

There is a striking similarity to Alcaeus 304/Sappho 44a, especially in lines 26–29, in which Hestia swears to be a *parthenos* forever. Without the restorations in Alcaeus 304/Sappho 44a we can see similarities between ὤμοσε δὲ μέγαν ὅρκον (26) and παρθένος ἔσσεσθαι πάντ' ἤματα (28) in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* and μέγαν ὄρκον ἀπώμοσε (4) and ἄϊ παρθένος ἔσσομαι (5) in the Aeolic fragment. The three letters λαν at the beginning of line 5 could be the end of κεφάλαν

(as in Page's restoration, see above), making a further parallel to line 26 of the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. Zeus' approval is expressed in both passages, although the language used is different.

Of course this correspondence has been noticed before. Most scholars discussing these passages suggest that they are either both copying an earlier hymn to Artemis or that one passage is imitating the other.[59] Perhaps this is formulaic language, as we see a third example in an Athenian grave monument from the 6th century belonging to a girl named Phrasikleia:

> σῆμα Φρασικλείας· κούρη κεκλήσομαι αἰεί,
> ἀντὶ γάμου παρὰ θεῶν τοῦτο λαχοῦσ' ὄνομα
>
> CEG 24; Attica c. 550 BCE

> This is the grave of Phrasikleia. I will always be called *korē*,
> having received this name as my lot from the gods instead of marriage.[60]

This grave monument combines what we see in the Aeolic fragment and the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. On the one hand, the first-person statement κόρη κεκλέσομαι αἰεί is parallel to the Aeolic ἄϊ πάρθενος ἔσσομαι, and on the other hand the phrase ἀντὶ γάμου … ὄνομα is parallel to γέρας ἀντὶ γάμοιο in line 29 of the *Homeric Hymn*.[61]

This language also has parallels in the Pandora stories in Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days*. There, men are given a κακόν, "an evil thing," instead of fire: αὐτίκα δ' ἀντὶ πυρὸς τεῦξεν κακὸν ἀνθρώποισι· ("And straightaway he gave an evil thing to men instead of fire," Hes. *Th.* 570); τοῖς δ' ἐγὼ ἀντὶ πυρὸς δώσω κακόν ("And I will give to them an evil thing instead of fire," Hes. *W&D* 57). The connections between the *sēma* of Phrasikleia and the hymns to Artemis and Hestia seem strong, but the Hesiodic language complicates the picture. Perhaps all of these passages are in dialogue with each other or are meaningful allusions, but they might also present an example of traditional language. Regardless of the exact relationship among them, marriage is involved in all and ties them together thematically. There is also a striking correspondence that in Hesiod a wife is the evil man gets instead of fire, and in the *Homeric Hymn*

59 Scholars vary on which follows which with West (2002) 217 thinking that the Aeolic fragment copies the *Homeric Hymn* and Faulkner (2008) 101 thinking the borrowing more likely goes the other way, since Hestia's presence seems unique.

60 Sēma of Phrasikleia, Athens ca. 550 BCE (CEG 24).

61 Svenbro (1993) 19–20 argues that the grave monument directly alludes to Hestia's role in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*.

to Aphrodite Hestia gets her permanent place by the fire instead of becoming a wife. This detail might even support an argument against the Hestia passage being adapted from a hymn to Artemis—the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* may preserve a remnant of Hestia's lost mythology.

More narrowly, in the case of the Aeolic fragment and the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, asking who copies whom or which copies which are the wrong questions. It is not simply this *Homeric Hymn* and this Lesbian hymn that have something in common. Rather, as I have shown with Alcaeus' other hymns, there are many correlations between these groups of narrative hymns. It is not that one copies the other, but that there is a shared traditional background. This is also different from the claim that there was, say, an earlier hymn to Artemis that both Alcaeus/Sappho and the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* are copying, for these are all part of an oral tradition that is fluid and mutable; there was no set text of an earlier hymn to be copied.[62]

Conclusions

While there are many similarities between the group of *Homeric Hymns* and the narrative hymns of Alcaeus, there is also an important difference: one is recited hexameter and the other is song. I do not argue, however, that these hymns are in the same tradition; my point, rather, is that they have a shared traditional background. Alcaeus 304/ Sappho 44a is too fragmentary to allow us to reconstruct the exact meter, but the best preserved line is composed of Aeolic dactyls,[63] which might further point back to an earlier shared tradition. As Nagy writes, "there is enough evidence, then, to conclude that what the rhapsodes recited was directly descended from what earlier singers had sung."[64] We might even want to think of Demodocus' second song in *Odyssey* 8, the so-called "Lay of Ares and Aphrodite" which is sung accompanied to the lyre, as an early example of a sung narrative, hexameter hymn.[65]

62 For the *Homeric Hymns* as oral poetry see Nagy (1982); (2011); Furley (2011) 207; Janko (1982) 18 ff.

63 Cf. Lobel and Page (1952) 2.

64 Nagy (1990) 28.

65 There is also the possibility that the performance itself is not supposed to be in hexameter, but was lyric, but is rendered into hexameter to fit into the hexameter of the larger composition, the *Odyssey*. Given that the narrator's voice blends with Demodocus', however, it seems to me more likely that this is an originally hexametrical song; cf. Clay (1989) 4; Nagy (2011) 329–332 analyzes this song as a hymnic *prooimion*; West (2015) discusses this song alongside the "lyric epic" of Stesichorus.

From the evidence of the extant fragments, I argue that at least two separate hymnic genres exist in our corpus of Lesbian hymns and that they roughly are divided into the hymns attributed to Sappho and Alcaeus respectively. The hymn to Artemis, known both as Sappho 44a and Alcaeus 304, belongs in this latter group of narrative hymns. This does not guarantee that Alcaeus is its author, but it fits better into the corpus of songs attributed to him and we should be wary of trying to glean information about Sappho's life or circumstances from it. Furthermore, I have suggested that Alcaeus' hymns belong to a tradition of narrative hymns related to that of the *Homeric Hymns*. Perhaps by recognizing these divisions and similarities, we can form a better idea not only about the genres of Greek hymns, but about how these genres can inform our view of ancient authorship. Authorial attribution to fragmentary songs might give us a lens with which to better view these ancient authors, but our own conception of the author might reflect back our critical biases instead.

Bibliography

Allen, T.W. and E.E. Sykes. 1904. *The Homeric Hymns*. London.

Allen, T.W., W.R. Halliday, and E.E. Sykes. 1963. *The Homeric Hymns*. Amsterdam.

Bergk, T. 1866. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*. Leipzig.

Bierl, A., R. Lämmle, and K. Wesselmann. 2007. *Literatur und Religion I*. Berlin.

Bouchon, R., P. Brillet-Dubois, and N. Le Meur-Weissman, eds. 2012. *Hymnes de la grèce antique: approches littéraires et historiques*. Lyon.

Bowie, E. 1994. "Philostratus: Writer of Fiction." In *Greek Fiction*, ed. J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman, 181–199. London.

Bowie, E. 2009. "Wandering Poets, Archaic Style." In *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*, ed. R. Hunter and I.C. Rutherford, 105–136. Cambridge.

Bowra, C.M. 1936. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Oxford.

Bremer, J.M. 1981. "Greek Hymns." In *Faith, Hope and Worship*, ed. H.S. Versnel, 193–215. Leiden.

Burnett, A.P. 1983. *Three Archaic Poets*. Cambridge, MA.

Burris, S., J. Fish, and D. Obbink. "New Fragments of Book 1 of Sappho." *ZPE* 189: 1–28.

Cairns, F. 1971. "Five 'Religious' Odes of Horace (I, 10; I, 21 and IV, 6; I, 30; I, 15)." *TAPA* 92: 433–452.

Calame, C. 1997. *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece*. Lanham.

Campbell, D.A. 1982. *Greek Lyric I*. Cambridge, MA.

Clay, J.S. 1989. *The Politics of Olympus*. Princeton.

Daux, G. 1973. "Les ambiguïtés de grec KOPH." *CRAI* 117: 382–393.

Dyck, A.R. 1983. *Epimerismi Homerici*. Vol. 1. Berlin.

Dyck, A.R. 1995. *Epimerismi Homerici*. Vol. 2. Berlin.
Faulkner, A. 2008. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. Oxford.
Faulkner, A., ed. 2011. *The Homeric Hymns*. Oxford.
Faulker, A. and O. Hodkinson. 2015. *Hymnic Narrative and the Narratology of Greek Hymns*. Leiden.
Furley, W.D., and J.M. Bremer. 2001. *Greek Hymns*. Tübingen.
Greene, E. 1996. *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches*. Berkeley.
Jeanmaire, H. 1939. *Couroi et Courètes*. Lille.
Holder, A. 1967. *Pomponi Porfyrionis Commentum in Horatium Flaccum*. Hildesheim.
Hunter, R., and I.C. Rutherford, eds. 2009. *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge.
Janko, R. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*. Cambridge.
Keil, H. 1874. *Grammatici Latini*. Vol. 6. Hildescheim.
Kirkwood, G.M. 1974. *Early Greek Monody*. Ithaca.
Kontoleon, N. 1970. *Aspects de la Grèce préclassique*. Paris.
Lardinois, A. 1994. "Subject and Circumstance in Sappho's Poetry." *TAPA* 124: 57–84.
Lardinois, A. 1996. "Who Sang Sappho's Songs?" in Greene (1996), ed: 150–172.
Lardinois, A. 2001. "Keening Sappho." In *Making Silence Speak*, ed. A. Lardinois and L. McClure, 75–92. Princeton.
Lefkowitz, M. 1981. *Lives of the Greek Poets*. Baltimore.
Lefkowitz, M. 1996. "Critical Stereotypes and the Poetry of Sappho." In Greene (1996) ed., 26–34.
Liberman, G. 1999. *Alcée Fragments*. Paris.
Lobel, E., and D.L. Page. 1952. "A New Fragment of Aeolic Verse." *CQ* 2: 1–3.
Morgan, J.R., and R. Stoneman. 1994. *Greek Fiction*. London.
Morrison, A. 2007. *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.
Nagy, G. 1982. "Hesiod." In *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome*, ed. T.J. Luce, 43–73. New York.
Nagy, G. 1990. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.
Nagy, G. 2007. "Did Sappho and Alcaeus Ever Meet?" in *Literatur und Religion I.*, ed. A. Bierl, R. Lämmle, and K. Wesselmann, 211–269. Berlin.
Nagy, G. 2010. *Homer the Preclassic*. Berkeley.
Nagy, G. 2011. "The Earliest Phases in the Reception of the *Homeric Hymns*." In Faulkner (2011), ed: 280–333.
Obbink, D. 2014. "Two New Poems by Sappho." *ZPE* 189: 32–49.
Obbink, D. 2015. "Interim Notes on 'Two New Poems of Sappho'." *ZPE* 194: 1–8.
Page, D.L. 1955. *Sappho and Alcaeus*. Oxford.
Pulleyn, S. 1997. *Prayer in Greek Religion*. Oxford.
Putnam. M.C.J. 1974. "Mercuri, facunde nepos Atlantis." *CP* 69: 215–217.
Race, W.H. 1990. *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes*. Atlanta.

Race, W.H. 1997. *Pindar: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments*. Cambridge, MA.

Richardson, N. 2010. *Three Homeric Hymns*. Cambridge.

Richardson, N. 2015. "Constructing a Hymnic Narrative: Tradition and Innovation in the Longer *Homeric Hymns*." in Faulkner (2015) ed., 19–30. Leiden.

Sissa, G. 1990. *Greek Virginity*. Cambridge, MA.

Snyder, J.M. 1991. "Public Occasion and Private Passion in the Lyrics of Sappho of Lesbos." In *Women's History and Ancient History*, ed. S. Pomeroy, 1–19. Chapel Hill.

Svenbro, J. 1993. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. Tr. J.E. Lloyd. Ithaca.

Treu, M. 1963. *Sappho*. Munich.

Vergados, A. 2012. *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Berlin.

Voigt, 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus*. Amsterdam.

Wilson, L.H. 1996. *Sappho's Sweetbitter Songs*. New York.

West, M.L. 2002. "View from Lesbos." In *Epea Pteroenta*, ed. M. Reichel and A. Rengakos, 207–219. Stuttgart.

West, M.L. 2011. "The First *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysus." In Faulkner (2011), ed: 29–43.

West, M.L. 2015. "Epic, Lyic, and Lyric Epic." In *Stesichorus in Context*, ed. P.J. Finglass, 63–80. Cambridge.

CHAPTER 13

Which Sappho? The Case Study of the Cologne Papyrus*

Elisabetta Pitotto and Amedeo A. Raschieri

1 Introduction

From the *editio princeps* of P. Köln inv. 21351+21376 (third century BCE) by Gronewald and Daniel[1] until now, much has been written on the many and complex issues related to this new piece of papyrological evidence for Sappho's oeuvre. The scholarly debate has been heated and has spared no aspect of the editorial and exegetic process, from the deciphering of the Cologne lines to the relation between the different sections of its text, from the criteria, if any, underlying this sequence of songs to the authorial identity discernable in each section.

The picture, complex in itself, becomes even more muddled when the partial overlap with P. Oxy. 1787, frr. 1 and 2 is taken into account, a previously known *testimonium* dating back to the second century CE. The two papyri share a twelve-line section, the so-called "Song on old age" (P. Oxy. 1787 fr. 1, lines 10 to 21,[2] and P. Köln inv. 21351+21376, column I line 12 to column II line 8) but, as we will see in more detail later, they differ in their respective initial and final sections.

* This paper results from the joint survey by both authors; however, sections 1 and 2 are to be ascribed to Amedeo A. Raschieri, and sections 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 to Elisabetta Pitotto. This final version has been revised with the precious help of Deborah Boedeker, who not only polished up our English but also offered many suggestions to better make our points; we are the only ones to be blamed for any remaining inaccuracy.

1 See Gronewald and Daniel (2004 a–b); (2005).

2 On the confused traces of the first line in P. Oxy 1787 as attested in fr. 58 V., see Burzacchini (2007); Raschieri (2008a).

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004339705_015

]ọκ[ό]λπων κάλα δῶρα, πα̣ῖδες,
]μ̣ *φ̣ι̣λ' ἀοιδο̣ν̣* λ̣ι̣γῦραν χελύνναν
[–]
]ποτ̣' [ἔ]οντα χρόα γῆρας ἤ̣δη
ἐγ]ε̣νοντο τ̣ρίχες ἐγ μελαίναν,
[–]
βάρυς δέ μ' ὀ [θ]ῦμο̣ς̣ πεπόηται, γό̣να δ' οὐ φέροισι
τὰ δή ποτα λαίψη̣ρ' ἔον ὄρχησθ' ἴσα νεβρίοισιν.
–
τὰ στεναχίζω θαμέως· ἀλλὰ τί κεμ ποείην;
ἀγήραον ἄνθρωπον ἔοντ' οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι·
[–]
καὶ γάρ π[ο]τ̣α̣ Τίθωνον ἔφαντο βροδόπαχυν Αὔων
ἔρωι δ' ἐ̣[λ]άθ̣εισαν βάμεν' εἰς ἔσχατα γᾶς φέροισα[ν
–
ἔοντα̣ [κ]ἀ̣λ̣ον καὶ νέον, ἀλλ' αὔτον ὔμως ἔμαρψε[
χρόνωι π̣ό̣λ̣ιογ γῆ̣ρας ἔχ̣[ο]ν̣τ̣' ἀ̣θα̣νάταν ἄκοιτιν.
–

"Song on old age," P. Oxy. 1787 ll. 10–21 and P. Köln inv. 21351 + 21376, col. 1 ll. 12–15, col. 2, ll. 1–8

S. BUZZI and F. PICCIONI, with changes in italics

… the violet-rich Muses' fine gifts, children … φ̣ι̣λ' ἀοιδο̣ν̣ (?) sweet lyre … skin was once soft is withered now … hair has turned white which once was black, my heart has been weighed down, my knees, which once were swift to dance like young fawns, fail me. How often I lament these things. But what can you do? No being that is human can escape old age. For people used to think that Dawn with rosy arms, *driven by love, went with* Tithonus, *who was* fine and young, to the edges of the earth; yet still grey old age in time did seize him, though he had a deathless wife

D. OBBINK, with changes in italics

A comprehensive survey of Sapphic fragments attested by multiple *testimonia* will demonstrate the uniqueness of such discrepancies. In almost all the other cases,[3] the different readings that appear in papyri ranging from the first to

3 P. Oxy. 7 and P. Oxy. 2289 fr. 6, registering fr. 5 V. (few letters in common at lines 15 and 17–18); P. Oxy. 1231 frr. 1 and 36, PSI 123, P. Oxy. 2289 fr. 9, and P. Oxy. 2166a, registering frr. 16 and 17 V. See Ox. Pap. X p. 41 for a comparison between PSI 123 and P. Oxy 1231 attesting fr. 17 V.; lastly, P. Oxy. 1232 and P. Oxy. 2076, registering fr. 44 V.

third centuries CE are limited to nuances of dialect in single words, a likely effect of the different usage to which each papyrus was destined. This might be the case, for example, in the double attestation of fr. 44 V.: P. Oxy. 1232, possibly an anthology and freer in its textual layout, has ἐλέλυσδον, while P. Oxy. 2076, a critical edition revised with attention to the smallest linguistic features, uses the Aeolic variant ὀλόλυζον.[4]

The nearest *comparandum* to our case study is offered by the variant endings of Sappho's fragment 2 V., as attested by the *ostrakon Florentinum* (third century BCE) and by Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 11, 463e. In the direct testimony, the song closes with the participle οἰνοχόεισα referring to Aphrodite, but after the same οἰνοχόεισα, the indirect quotation adds the further determination τούτοις τοῖς ἑταίροις ἐμοῖς γε καὶ σοῖς. While both options, as Nagy has stated, "are compatible with the singing of Sappho's songs by men and boys at Athenian symposia,"[5] they allude to the performance context in slightly different terms. On the one hand, the *ostrakon Florentinum* hints at its sympotic setting rather neutrally, by a simple reference to Aphrodite pouring wine; on the other hand, Athenaeus' text is marked by the term ἑταίροις, which suggests a context featuring political associations *inter pocula*.

Against this background, it is clear that the number of Cologne lines diverging from the previously known Oxyrhynchus ones and the substantial differences in the passages written at the beginning and end of each papyrus pose a difficult problem, which scholars have been trying to solve since 2004.

2 Preliminary Assumptions

Out of so many general issues, we focus here on matters related to authoriality, and begin by stating three preliminary assumptions.

[2.1] First of all, we will base our investigation on the text printed in *Nuove acquisizioni di Saffo e della lirica greca*,[6] a miscellaneous volume to which we ourselves contributed. We note that our views on the two most serious *cruces*—the proper *distinctio* to be applied to the later portion of line 11 column I (καλάμοις *vs.* κάλα Μοῖσ'), and the exact letters to be found at the beginning of line 6 column II (ερωιδ.[.]α̣θ̣εισαν)—happen to coincide with the most recent contributions on these very matters, including the critical editions by Obbink and Hammerstaedt in *The New Sappho on Old Age*.[7]

4 See Pernigotti (2001) 12–14.

5 See Nagy (2009).

6 See Aloni (2008).

7 See Obbink (2009); Hammerstaedt (2009).

[2.2] Secondly, we will assume the following paleographic features and internal links and/or partitions.

The Cologne papyrus opens with eleven lines of a Sapphic song unknown up to 2004, to be called henceforth the "New Sappho":

] π̣α
] . αι
] . α̣ν̣
].ο.[
]ε̣υ . [
] . νῦν θ̣α̣λ̣[ί]α . [
] . ν̣έρθε δὲ γ̣ᾶς π̣ε . [
[κλέος μέγα Μοίσειο]ν̣ ἔχο̣ι̣σαν γέρας ὠς [ἔ]ο̣ικε̣ν̣,
[ψῦχαί / σκίαι κέ με θαυμά]ζοιεν ὠς νῦν ἐπὶ γᾶς ἔοισαν.
[φαίνην δὸς ἀοίδαν] λιγύ̣ραν, [α]ἴ̣ κεν ἔλοισα πᾶκτιν
]α . . (3 letters) α̣ . (1 letter) κ̣άλα, Μοῖσ', ἀείδω.

"New Sappho" = P. Köln inv. 21351, col. 1, ll. 1–11

E. PITOTTO

… now the celebration … and below the earth … (great glory … me) upon whom the privilege of the Muses is rightly bestowed; (the souls / the shadows) would marvel at me, just like now, when I am on the earth. A sweet (song) grant me to perform when, taken the *paktin*, … fair things, o Muse, I sing.

E. PITOTTO

These lines have been traced by the same hand that wrote the subsequent part of the *testimonium* down to column 2 line 8, displaying the same meter, dialect, and poetic diction as well. Moreover, no widening of the interlinear space is detectable in the connection between this first segment and the second one, which is the twelve lines in common with the Oxyrhynchus roll. And while it is impossible to verify the actual absence of a *coronis* in the left margin because of the poor condition of the papyrus, the evidence at our disposal points towards a single and internally homogeneous textual section.

For its part, the beginning of P. Oxy. displays scant remains which have been identified as Sappho fr. 58 V., lines 1–10; in this case also, the initial section appears to be fully connected to the following lines, as is demonstrated by the continuity in meter and writing:

]ιδ’ ἀ[
]
].α
]ύ̣γοισα̣[ ]
].[. .]. .[ ]ι̣δάχθην
]χ̣υ θ[΄.]ο̣ι̣[.]αλλ[. . . . . . .]ύταν
].χθο.[.]ατί.[. . . . .]εισα
]μένα ταν[. . . . ὠ]νυμόν σε̣
]νι θῆται στ[ύ]μα[τι] πρό̣κοψιν

Oxyrhynchus beginning, P. Oxy. 1787, ll. 1–9 [= fr. 58 V., 2–10]

A.A. RASCHIERI

At the line-endings between lines 8 and 9 of its second column the Cologne papyrus displays a combination of *paragraphos* and zoomorphic *coronis* together with a detectable widening in the interlinear space. Thirteen very fragmentary lines of a so-called “Unknown song” follow, featuring un-Aeolic meter and dialect and a second, slightly later hand than the one responsible for the previous sections:

ψιθυροπλόκε δόλιε μύθω̣ν α̣ὐτουργ̣[(έ)
ἐπίβουλε π̣αῖ ⟦β̣ογ̣ο . [. . .]⟧`. . [.]γε ΄ [3–4] . ακ̣ [2–3] . [
ἑ̣ταῖρε̣ ἀφέ̣ρπω : δ[
[.] ⟦7–8⟧ [ ] . τ̣[
[.] . αν· ἄπνους πρ̣ . [
[φ]ά̣ο̣ς ἀσ̣τέρων τε[
[τ]ὸ̣ π̣υριφ̣ε̣γγ̣ὲ̣ς ἀελ̣[ί-
[.] . πᾶσ(’) ἀκού̣ω̣ : θ̣ . [
[.] . ου κόρον Ὀρφέα κ̣[
[ἔρ]πετὰ πά̣ντα κ[
[. .] . τὰν ἐρατὰν λα[
[εὔ]φθογγον λύραν . . [
[συ]νεργὸν ἔχοισα π . ν̣[

“Unknown song” P. Köln inv. 21351 + 21376, col. 2, ll. 9–23

S. FERRARINI and R.R. TREVISAN

Whisperer, betrayer, maker of lies ..., perfidious son/boy ... companion, I go away/die ... without breath ... the light of the stars ... the red-hot [splendor] of the sun everything (with all myself?) I listen ... the youth Orpheus ... all the animals ... the beloved ... the fine-sounding lyre ... having (*fem.*) as helper

our translation

P. Oxy., on the other hand, ends with four lines—that is, lines 23–26 of Sappho's fr. 58 V.—with no apparent sign of separation between line 22, the end of the previous section, and line 23:

]ịμέναν νομίσδει	(he/she) thinks
]αις ὀπάσδοι	might give
⌞ἔγω δὲ φίλημμ' ἀβροσύναν,⌟] τοῦτο καί μοι	but I love delicacy ... this and love has obtained
τὸ λά⌞μπρον ἔρως ἀελίω καὶ τὸ κά⌟λον λέλογχε.	for me the brightness and beauty of the sun.
	D. CAMPBELL

"Tetrastichos" (P. Oxy. 1787, frr. 1 [= fr. 58 V., 23–26])

The absence of separation is conspicuous, all the more so in a roll which resorts to *coronis* quite frequently to mark not only the ending, but also the beginning of a given song.[8]

This final "Tetrastichos," apparently continuing the section that P. Oxy. shares with P. Köln, has prompted scholarly discussions as to whether the original "Song on old age" was displayed by the Oxyrhynchus or by the Cologne *testimonium*; some arguing for Cologne have even suggested that the last four Oxyrhynchus lines should be considered as a (short) song in its own right, paleographic continuity notwithstanding.[9]

A brilliant solution to the *querelle* has come from dismissing the concept of the "one and only original version" and resorting, instead, to the notion of "alternative performative versions." In general, it is well suited to the communicative mechanism diffused in archaic and classical Greece and has been first applied to the binomial "Oxyrhynchus song on old age" *vs* "Cologne song on old age" by Boedeker, Lardinois, and Nagy in particular.[10]

[2.3] This hint at the possible responsibility of actual performances in shaping the Cologne textual sequence prompts, by contrast, our third (and last) preliminary assumption.

8 See fr. 3, lines 2–3 (frr. 61–62 V.), lines 14–15 (frr. 62–63 V.), *post* line 24 = end of column (fr. 63 V.); see also: frr. 20 + 17, frr. 31 + 21, fr. 40.

9 See on this point Di Benedetto (2004); (2006); Luppe (2004); Bernsdorff (2004); Magnani (2005); West (2005); Burzacchini (2007); Liberman (2007); Lundon (2007); Vandoni (2008).

10 See Boedeker (2009); Lardinois (2009); Nagy (2009). Attempts have been made even at imagining different performance arenas to go with the two surviving versions of the "song on old age": see especially Lardinois (2009) 51–55.

While the essence of the Cologne papyrus remains debatable in several respects, fewer doubts persist as far as the Oxyrhynchus *testimonium* is concerned. This second century CE papyrus features a version of the "Song on old age" whose roots appear very ancient, as could be suggested by a possible echoing in Euripides. In *Alcestis* 993–996 the substantive ἄκοιτιν and the verb νομιζέσθω follow each other in the same order in which they appear in Sappho's fr. 58 V., lines 22–23; this coincidence has been singled out by Di Benedetto as a meaningful proof that the Oxyrhynchus sequence had been circulating from at least the fifth century BCE.[11] Nonetheless, this shall not lead us to misjudge the nature of P. Oxy.: as the paleographic analysis by Funghi and Messeri Savorelli has demonstrated, it was written by the same hand found in the Oxyrhynchus papyri 1604, 1788, 2442, 2443, 2445 and 2446, a group of rolls attesting songs by Sappho, Alcaeus, Alcman, and Pindar, and ultimately believed to mirror the editorial work of Alexandrian philologists.[12]

We note, however, that in recent years[13] the view that different Hellenistic arrangements of the Sapphic *corpus* had been published and circulated in ancient times has been receiving more and more support: to be mentioned as precious clues in this respect are, for example, the confusing evidence about the actual existence of a ninth book of epithalamians and the hint made by Hephaestion to the possibility of consulting ἀρχαῖοι ἀντίγραφοι, a meaningful plural in the Greek text.[14] Against this background, we should revise the firm belief expressed by Funghi and Messeri Savorelli that this represents *the* Hellenistic edition of Sappho. Nonetheless, while we cannot—and shall not—maintain that the Oxyrhynchus papyrus registers *the* Hellenistic approved version of Sapphic songs, it is still safe to assume that it displays *a* text, *one of* the texts, resulting from the Hellenistic editorial expertise.

3 The Cologne-Sappho without the "Unknown Song"—Part I, the "Song on Old Age"

Given these assumptions, we can now turn our full attention to authorship, authority, and authenticity-related issues as they feature in the Cologne papyrus.

11 See Di Benedetto (2006).

12 See Funghi and Messeri Savorelli (1992).

13 See Yatromanolakis (1999); Liberman (2007).

14 Heph. *Poëm.* 1, 2 p. 63, 15 ss. Consbruch (Sappho T 228 V.).

[3.1] First to be taken into account are the characteristics and the nature of our artifact as far as the lines written by the first hand are concerned.

Our surveys in this respect show that important common points exist between this "Cologne 1.0" and P. Oxy. First is the typology of handwriting, accurate and librarian, even slower in the Cologne lines than in the Oxyrrhynchus ones; next is the recourse to critical signs to mark the prosodic articulation of the song in question (in both cases systematic *paragraphoi* highlight stanza end, each stanza being formed by two identical acephalous hipponacteans with internal double choriambic expansion), and the textual boundaries of a given composition (as we have said above, the use of *coronides* is well attested in both *testimonia*).

Starting from these substantial common features, we put forward a new proposal: if P. Oxy. ultimately results from Hellenistic editorial work on the Sapphic *corpus*, the similarity between the two *testimonia* strongly suggests that P. Köln as well stems from the same roots and features the same "authenticity-oriented" conception of authorship.

To better define this important point of our paper, by "authenticity-oriented" we mean that both papyri included only those texts approved as fully consistent with the idea a given Hellenistic editor maintained of the poetic production by a given ancient author, in our case Sappho. Let it be added, however, that these ideal guidelines according to which a given text was accepted or athetized do not stem directly from the archaic age, but progressively crystallized through stratified reperformances in contexts, occasions, and sociopolitical situations possibly quite different from the original ones. Therefore, it is worth emphasizing that the Hellenistic patent of authenticity, bestowed upon certain songs and not upon others, does not necessarily coincide with the effectively authentic works by a given author.

4 Oxyrhynchus and First-Hand Cologne: Similarities and Differences

[4.1] If it really were the case that the Cologne papyrus minus the lines added by the second hand is related to Hellenistic editorial work, it is particularly worth mentioning the pivotal importance that should then be attributed to the *paragraphoi*.

Their presence would convey the precise will to clarify the metrical nature of the registered text. Without the help of performative elements such as vocal and/or instrumental repetitions to mark each stanza, the succession of identical lines could easily lead to misinterpreting the sequence "New Sappho" + Cologne "Song on old age" as a κατὰ στίχον, and not a κατὰ σχέσιν, poem. And

FIGURE 13.1

the need of an indisputable, straightforward definition of the metrical nature of a given song is particularly important in the case of Sapphic editions, which were ordered κατὰ μέτρον,[15] with the possible exception of the aforementioned ninth book of a thematically and performative homogeneous collection of epithalamians.

It could follow that prosody was an elective criterion to arrange Sapphic poems well established in the early Hellenistic period: as early, in fact, as the Cologne papyrus itself. Hypothetically—but quite suggestively—the Cologne papyrus could then be assimilated to those ἀρχαῖοι ἀντίγραφοι which, in Hephaestion's own words, were peculiar in that they marked clearly the nature and the subdivision of stanzas formed by identical lines.

[4.2] Of course, the emphasis we place on the aforementioned similarities should not lead us to forget the striking differences between the Oxyrhynchus text and the first-hand Cologne sequence.

One important aspect of discrepancy is to be found in accents, apostrophes, breathings and quantity marks. These critical signs are absent in the Cologne text, and bitterly missed, for example, when faced with the ambiguous *distinctio* at line 11, column 1 (καλάμοις *vs*. κάλα Μοῖσ'). By contrast, the Oxyrhynchus roll resorts to them whenever it is necessary to clarify the quantity of a given syllable, the position of the accent in a given word, or the internal articulation of a string of letters.

The most notable example is offered by the apostrophe clearly visible in P. Oxy. 1787, fr. 1 line 11.

Unless it is proven that the apostrophe has been traced mistakenly, we are faced with paleographic evidence that clearly indicates a separation between *phil*(*e*) and *aoidon*, instead of the one-word epithet φιλάοιδον, as per Maas' conjecture and subsequent well-established editorial habit.[16]

This different use of critical signs is to be ascribed to the effects that the preparation of a given roll for its deployment as a school text had on the

15 See Liberman (2007) and Lidov (2009a) 106–111.

16 See, e.g., the text and the apparatus printed in Lobel and Page (1955) and in Voigt (1971).

layout of the texts it registered. That the intervention of the διορθώτης on a piece of poetry consisted also of punctuation and stress/pitch marks, which helped the student scanning the registered texts properly, has been pointed out most recently by Gregory Nagy, who analyzes the forty-lines sample of *Iliad* 24.247 from the Bankes Papyrus (BM Papyrus 14) to explain the massive presence of tone markings as a guide to correct hexametric reading.[17] The parallel is particularly compelling because the Bankes Homer dates back to the second century CE, which makes it a slightly earlier roll than P. Oxy. 1787 and establishes the school-oriented διόρθωσις of poetical texts as a common practice by the time the Sapphic papyrus from Oxyrhynchus was written down.

As far as the use of critical signs is concerned, then, surviving evidence leads us to believe that the third century CE Oxyrhynchus was very likely subjected to a process of didactic revision, while the third century BCE first-hand-only Cologne was not.

[4.3] A second element distinguishing the two *testimonia* lies in the alphabetic variations characterizing the same text as written in two different papyri. Specifically, the Cologne papyrus features a great number of assimilations, arguably under the influence of actual performances and consequently pronunciation of a given string of words, while the Oxyrhynchus papyrus resorts to the orthodox sequence of letters: see for example the contrasting occurrences of ἐγ μελαίναν in P. Köln inv. 21351+21376, col. I, l. 15, *vs.* ἐκ μελαίναν in P. Oxy 1787, fr. 1, l. 13; and of κεμ ποιείην in P. Köln inv. 21351+21376, col. II, l. 3, *vs.* κεν ποιείην in P. Oxy 1787, fr. 1, l. 16.[18]

The same is valid for the rendition of the voiced alveolar fricative with one letter, *zeta*, and not with the canonized Aeolic couple *sigma* + *delta*,[19] systematically employed instead in the Oxyrhynchus roll: compare for example]ζοιεν in P. Köln inv. 21351, col. I, l. 9, and στεναχίζω in P. Köln inv. 21351+21376, col. II, l. 3 on the one hand, and on the other one νομίσδει in P. Oxy. 1787, fr. 1, l. 22 and ὀπάσδοι in P. Oxy. 1787, fr. 1, l. 23.

What we argued for the critical signs is valid in this case also: the difference might stem from the erudite, school-oriented re-elaboration to which P. Oxy. (and not P. Köln) was subjected, with the intention of bringing the "Song on old age" back to its supposedly original dialectal *facies* after centuries of reperformances including in linguistically non-Aeolic areas.

17 Nagy (2011), in particular 254–256.

18 A further case of assimilation is to be found in P. Köln inv. 21351+21376, col. II, l. 8, πόλιογ γῆρας, with no surviving comparison with P. Oxy. 1787 because of a *lacuna* in the latter *testimonium*.

19 See, e.g., Méndez Dosuna (2007) and Karali (2007).

5 The Cologne-Sappho without the "Unknown Song"—Part II: Sapphic Hymns?

However, and without the slightest doubt, the major factor of discrepancy is the different textual arrangement attested in the two papyri. In this respect, we feel that something can be added to previous scholarship on this issue. Indeed, the scholarly attention focused on the two different endings has somehow neglected to analyze in due detail the different beginnings. We pursue here a point hinted at by Gronewald, Daniel, and Di Benedetto:[20] starting from the substantial continuity in meter, dialect, style, and paleographic traits between the first eleven and the following twelve Cologne lines, these scholars suggested that the "New Sappho" should be considered a proem to the subsequent "Song on old age."[21]

[5.1] We point out first that the reference νῦν θαλία ("New Sappho," line 6) seems readily compatible with a public, festive and/or agonistic occasion—precisely the kind of setting where the ancient communicative habit of introducing the main song by a proem creating the necessary link with the contingent performance arena was diffused.[22] In addition, it is worth stressing that many echoes occur between images and themes attested in the "New Sappho" and images and themes quite frequent in surviving προοίμια.

To be singled out are the references to current performance, evident in the brief depiction of the *persona loquens*' activity at lines 10–11 (ἔλοισα πᾶκτιν [...] / ἀείδω), which find a close parallel in the frequent occurrences of various forms of ἀείδω to be found all through the surviving *corpus* of archaic songs fulfilling an introductory function.[23] The same coincidence is valid for the apostrophe to the god(s) to whom the proem and the subsequent song are dedicated, a distinctive, immediately recognizable, feature that closes both the "New Sappho" (Μοῖσ[α], l. 11) and various proems from epic and lyric traditions.[24]

---

20 Gronewald and Daniel (2004a–b); Di Benedetto (2005).

21 See Boedeker (2009) 74 and 80, and Boedeker (forthcoming), which the author has kindly allowed us to read before publication.

22 See *h. Dion.* (26), 12–13; *h. Aphr.* (6), 19–20; Quint. 4.1.2.

23 See *h. Dem.* (2), 495; *h. Ap.* (3), 546; *h. Herm.* (4), 580; *h. Aphr.* (6), 21; *h. Dion.* (7), 59; *h. Art.* (9), 8; *h. Aphr.* (10), 6; *h. Met.* (14), 6; *h. Ascl.* (16), 5; *h. Pan.* (19), 48–49; *h. Ap.* (21), 5; *h. Hest.* (24), 5; *h. Mus. et Ap.* (25), 7; *h. Art. et Apoll.*. (27), 22; *h. Ath.* (28), 18; *h. Hest.* (29), 14; *h. Gen* (30), 19; *h. Diosc.* (33), 19; Sim. fr. 11 ²W. 23.

24 See Terp. °7 Gostoli; *h. Dem.* (2), 492–494; *h. Ap.* (3), 545; *h. Herm.* (4), 579; *h. Aphr.* (6), 19; *h. Dion.* (7); *h. Her.* (15), 9; *h. Diosc.* (17), 2; *h. Herm.* (18), 12; *h. Heph.* (20), 8; *h. Poseid.* (22), 6; *h. Dia* (23), 4; *h. Mus. et Ap.* (25), 6; *h. Dion.* (26), 11; *h. Art. et Apoll.* (27), 21; *h. Ath.* (28), 17; *h. Hest.* (29), 13; *h. Gen* (30), 17; *h. Sel.* (32), 17–18; Sim. fr. 11 ² W., 20–24.

Also relevant is the fixed theme of wishes for the up-coming song, a traditional ending note in proemial diction[25] that appears in κάλα [...] ἀείδω (line 11).

[5.2] It is especially worth noticing that a similarly well-wishing closure recurs in the lines that precede the "Song on old age" in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus also: however incomplete, the direct evidence attests the very meaningful ending στύματι [...] πρόκοψιν ("success for the mouth," fr. 58 V., l. 10).

We are well aware that the textual base is so scant that it does not grant enough elements on which to build a reasonably well-grounded hypothesis; still, it is quite tempting to assume two tightly interlaced points: not only did this expression of confident hope for a favorable reception of the main song to follow end a proem; evidently, it also was a different proem from the Cologne "New Sappho." We would be faced, then, with two introductory sections fulfilling the same proemial function through similar—because traditionally codified—themes and images but through differing verbal realizations. Consequently, the notion of alternative performative versions should be extended from the endings of the "Song on old age" with and without the Oxyrhynchus "Tetrastichos" to its beginnings, with two different versions of this same song being introduced by different proems.

[5.3] Two further remarks can be drawn from these observations.

First, and on a more general level, the existence of (at least) two proems gravitating around the Sapphic *corpus*—inferable in our opinion from the pair P. Oxy. 1787, fr. 1, ll. 1–10 / P. Köln 21351 ll. 1–11—seems consistent with other pieces of indirect evidence: the collection of proems attributed to Terpander, which is a tradition of Aeolic roots not too far from the Sapphic one,[26] and most importantly, a red-figure *hydria* (Athens, Archaeological Museum, inv. no. 1260) dating to 440–430 BCE and attributed to the Group of Polygnotos, which represents Sappho holding a roll on which a number of letters can be read.[27]

They form a line, θεοί, ἠερίων ἐπέων ἄρχομαι,[28] of unmistakable proemial flair, and it would not make much sense if the testimony as a whole combined two

25 See *h. Aphr.* (6), 19–20; *h. Ar.* (8), 15–17; *h. Aphr.* (10), 5; *h. Ath.* (11), 5; *h. Her.* (15), 9; *h. Heph.* (20), 8; *h. Dia* (23), 4; *h. Hest.* (24), 5; *h. Dion.* (26), 12–13; *h. Met.* (30), 18; Sapp. fr. 160 V.

26 See Gostoli (1990) 146–148.

27 See Yatromanolakis (2008) 146–160, for a first commentary on this image, though not from a "proemial" point of view. The following reproduction comes from http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fichier:NAMA_Sappho_lisant.jpg.

28 "Gods, with airy words I begin" (translated by D. Yatromanolakis).

FIGURE 13.2 *Red-figure vase (hydria, or kalpis) by the Group of Polygnotos, ca. 440–430 BC. Seated, Sappho is reading one of her poems to a group of three student-friends.* NATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUM IN ATHENS, 1260

elements—Sappho on the one hand and προοίμια on the other one—which had no connection with everyday performances.[29] It is far more reasonable to assume that the co-existence of portrait and inscription rooted in the actual and well-established habit of introducing a Sapphic song through a suitable "Sapphic hymn," as in the better-attested case of Homeric epic and related proems.[30]

29 See Yatromanolakis (2008) 51–56.

30 Compare Boychenko's analysis (Ch. 12) of Sappho's hymns as "cletic," that is, generically opposed to the narrative ("Homeric") type.

Secondly, and dealing more specifically with the relationship between the Cologne and the Oxyrhynchus openings, it looks as if, in the progressively narrowing bottle-neck represented by Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic canonization of the works by archaic poets, the Oxyrhynchus proem had been at some point selected as the original one: this likely is the reason why it has survived through the centuries, recorded in a text-book roll such as P. Oxy. 1787. The Cologne proem—though deemed authentic in the first place, and therefore used in connection with "really Sapphic" lines as the ones of the "Song on old age"—had ended up being discarded, only to be brought back to life with the fortuitous discovery of P. Köln.

6 The Cologne-Sappho "Unknown Song" Included

[6.1] The picture changes dramatically as soon as the "Unknown song" is thrown back into the equation. While both its meter and dialect are not fully compatible with a genuinely Aeolic tradition, or rather, with the canonized image delivered to us by Hellenistic philology, its content makes an obvious allusion to Sapphic *milieu* and poetry.

Links to this traditional *substratum* are activated mostly through the mention of Orpheus, whose head famously floated to the Lesbian coast;[31] through the subtle resorting, in the initial apostrophe, to a god whose identity remains uncertain;[32] through *variatio in imitando* of lines acknowledged as Sapphic;[33] and even through the possible presence of Sappho herself at the end of the surviving portion of the "Unknown song." Assuming that εὔφθογγον λύραν ("Unknown song," l. 12) is the direct object of ἔχοισα ("Unknown song," l. 13) and that συνεργόν ("Unknown song," l. 13) its predicative, a female character would act "having the well-resounding lyre as her assistant."[34] Sappho then,

31 See *FGH* 45, 477, 2, and Phanocl. fr. 1 Powell, *CA* 106–108, on which Faraone (2005); Trevisan (2008) 151–153; Clayman (2009); and Pitotto (2012) par. 2.3.

32 Either Eros or Hermes: for a discussion of both identifications, see Rawles (2006) 11; Ferrarini (2008) 59–60 and n. 166; Trevisan (2008) 4.3.3b, p. 148 and n. 146; Pitotto (2012) par. 2.1.2.

33 See, e.g., the close proximity between the "Unknown song," lines 1–2 and Sappho's fragments 1.1–2 V. (ποικιλόθρον' ἀθανάτ' Ἀφροδίτα, / παῖ Δίος δολόπλοκε) and 188 V. (μυθόπλοκος). For a complete discussion of Sapphic echoings in the "Unknown song," see Magnani (2005) 42 n. 6, and Lundon (2007) 164.

34 A possibility explained in Trevisan (2008) 148–150. However, another grammatical construction is equally possible based on the surviving textual remains: συνεργόν might refer

although *stricto sensu* not the author of the "Unknown song," would still feature in it possibly as the *persona loquens* and certainly is evoked as the highest poetical authority through a web of allusions all through the "Unknown song."

[6.2] On a thematic level, further connections stem from the fact that the thirteen lines by the second hand develop the same themes previously touched upon in the "New Sappho" + the "Song on old age." In a nutshell, the papyrus as a whole deals with the limitations of human nature (ageing and ultimately dying) and portrays poetic activity as the only chance at human disposal to reach a partial share of immortality, thanks to the everlasting glory which poetry bestows upon its authors.

The "Song on old age," with the poignant anticipation νέρθε δὲ γᾶς in the "New Sappho" l. 7, revolves around the connected themes of death, the end awaiting every human being, and of getting older, which represents death's inevitable prologue. The same motif echoes in the "Unknown song" as well, which features at l. 3 the verb ἀφέρπω, "I am going away" meaning "I die" and at l. 5 the adjective ἄπνους, "not breathing" and therefore "death," and which hints at a mythological character, Orpheus, with immediate connections to death.[35]

But in contrast to such a dark perspective of physical decay and ultimately dissolution is the opposed polarity of the glory that poetic activity bestows upon whoever "picks the Pierian roses." It is a truth generally acknowledged in ancient poetry that not only the addressee of a given song would benefit from this undying glory, but its author as well.[36] Occurrences appear in the Sapphic *corpus* known to us before the Cologne discovery:[37] particularly meaningful in this respect is fr. 55 V., where a rival who suitably remains anonymous is condemned to eternal oblivion because she has never been familiar with the activities sponsored by the Muses.

---

neither to the "well-resounding lyre" mentioned at line 12 nor to an undetermined element lost in the *lacuna*, but to the god apostrophized at lines 1–2. In this way, the theme of divine help, implicit in the introductory invocation, would be developed more clearly.

35 See Gronewald and Daniel (2005) 9; Rawles (2006) 11; Lundon (2007) 154; Ferrarini (2008b) 142; and Pitotto (2012) par. 2.2.2.

36 As far as *epos* is concerned, see the ten occurrences of the formula θεῖος ἀοιδός: in the nominative in *Od.* 4.17; 8.87, 539; 16.252; 17.353; 23.143; and 24.439; in the accusative in *Od.* 1.336; 8.43 and 74. Worth mentioning is also the condition of honorability described in *Od.* 8.69–70 and 479–481. As for encomiastic and epinician poetry, see Alcm. fr. 1 C., 82–91; Ibyc. fr. S151, 47–48; Pind. *Ol.* 1.115–116; 3.1–2; 6.105; 7.87–90 and 13.115 *Pyth.* 2.96 and 3.107–111; *Nem.* 8.35–39 and 9.53–55; *Paean.* fr. 52b Sn.-M., 102–103; fr. 52f Sn.-M., 1–6 and 102–103. All the aforementioned passages have been analyzed in Pitotto (2008b) 136–139.

37 See at least Gentili (2006^4) 118–119; Palmisciano (1998); Burzacchini (2008).

The texts registered in the new papyrus refer to the same conceptual horizon, as is made clear by the very choices of Tithonus and Orpheus as *exempla mythica* in the "Song on old age" ll. 9–12 and in the "Unknown song" l. 9 respectively. Both, however, deal with the positive side of poetic excellence and its otherworldly consequences. This motif represents the key to the whole Orphic saga, and Orpheus is an antonomastic character not only for the unhappy lover, but also for the excellent poet;[38] as for Tithonus, his body would have progressively lost its strength but his words would keep echoing for ever, as suggested in the mythological variant, attested already in Mimnermus, in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* and in Hellanicus.[39] And while the Cologne "Song on old age" does not hint at this detail, the aforementioned testimonies—anterior as they are to P. Köln 21351 + 21376—make it quite plausible that such a thematic *substratum* belonged to the traditional knowledge shared by the intended recipients of the papyrus itself.

The surviving portion of the "New Sappho" is also devoted to the interlacing of poetry, glory, and (im)mortality, in particular the two stanzas from line 6 to line 9.[40] Two different scenarios alternate, the present one, worldly and festive ("New Sappho" line 6, νῦν θαλία), and the eventual, otherworldly one ("New Sappho" line 7, νέρθε δὲ γᾶς). These two existential spheres—which at first sight appear antithetic, even mutually exclusive—are explicitly related to each other at "New Sappho" line 9 (με θαυμάζοιεν ὡς νῦν ἐπὶ γᾶς ἔοισαν); the comparison is inspired by the privileged condition ("New Sappho" line 8, γέρας)[41] which the poetess, *persona loquens*, suitably enjoys ("New Sappho" line 8, ὡς ἔοικεν) thanks to her very profession.

The exact terms of the comparison are unavoidably bound to change according to the ecdotic and exegetical choices made for the whole fragment. In our reconstruction, no trace suggests that the actual singing goes on *post mortem* as well;[42] it is the glory stemming from poetry itself which links Earth and after-

38 See Puglia (2008), Ferrarini (2008b), and Trevisan (2008).

39 See Mimn. *Nannò*, fr. 4 W.; *h. Aphr.* (5), 218–238; Hellan. *FGrHist* 4 F 140. On this theme, see further Aloni (1997), fr. 58 commentary *ad locum*; Rodríguez Somolinos (2005); Ferrari (2007) 102; Santamaría Álvarez (2007); Roselli (2008) 100; Faulkner (2008) 276; Clayman (2009) 132–133; and Pitotto (2012) par. 2.2.2.

40 See Di Benedetto (2005); Hardie (2005); West (2005); Rodríguez Somolinos (2006); Ferrari (2007) 70–72; Burzacchini (2008) 42–44; Pitotto (2008b); Lidov (2009b) 85–93; Stehle (2009) 125–127; Tsantsanoglou (2009); Pitotto (2012) par. 2.2.2 and 2.2.3; and Bierl (forthcoming).

41 See Vox (2007).

42 A possibility favored by Di Benedetto (2005).

life:[43] in this respect, the reference to a posthumous admiration on a par with the present one, preserved in "New Sappho" line 9 (ψῦχαί *vel* σκίαι κέ με θαυμάζοιεν ὡς νῦν ἐπὶ γᾶς ἔοισαν), is particularly meaningful.

The confident portraying of such an otherworldly condition occupies most of the second stanza (κλέος μέγα Μοίσειον ἔχοισαν γέρας ὡς ἔοικεν, / ψῦχαί *vel* σκίαι κέ με θαυμάζοιεν, "New Sappho" lines 8–9); only the last eight syllables of "New Sappho" line 9 (ὡς νῦν ἐπὶ γᾶς ἔοισαν) complete the chronological and narrative ring going back to Earth and present days. In a comparison with the preceding distich, which seems to feature an exactly symmetrical division between *hic et nunc* at "New Sappho" line 6 (νῦν θαλία) and otherworldly future at "New Sappho" line 7 (νέρθε δὲ γᾶς), a slight *variatio* in the expositive patterns would be introduced at lines 8–9, to better dwell upon the happy perspective of a poetic glory both eternal and eternizing.

7 Conclusions

[7.1] The strong link thus created between the two portions of the Cologne papyrus from both an authorial and a thematic point of view has been persuasively explained in performative terms.[44] In particular, it has been suggested that the sequence "Cologne song on old age" (i.e. the "New Sappho" as proem and then the "Song on old age") + "Unknown song" hides the traces of a thematically homogeneous relay performance, which could have taken place either in a public competition (e.g., the Panathenaic festival) or in a sympotic chain (see evidence on Sapphic poetry sung in Athenian symposia) or in subsequent, stratified reperformances in both the aforementioned settings.[45]

If this is the case, the papyrus as a whole can be interpreted as a script to guide successful future performances or as a transcript of a poetic association listened to in a given relay occasion and so appreciated as to be fixed for future

43 See Burzacchini (2008) 42–44; Pitotto (2008b) 134–136; Lidov (2009b) 85–93; and Stehle (2009) 125–127.

44 Other "performative papyri" (i.e. those featuring a textual sequence strongly influenced by actual performances of the registered texts) are for example P. Berol. inv. 13270 (IV–III BCE, the so-called "Elephantine songs"), P. Tebt. I, 1 and 2 (II–I BCE), the Euripidean *excerpta* in W.G. 304–307 (middle III sec. BCE, on which see Fassino (2003) 56), and the so-called "new Archilochus" (P. Oxy. 4708, late II CE, a possible sympotic chain registering two songs on Telephus: see Aloni and Iannucci (2007) *Appendice*, in particular 228–237 and n. 84).

45 See, e.g., Yatromanolakis (2008); Nagy (2009); Pitotto (2012) par. 4.2; and Bierl (forthcoming).

times by writing down the “Unknown song” in a roll already registering, as per one of the circulating Alexandrian editions, the “Song on old age” with its relative proem.[46]

[7.2] Building on this performative interpretation of the whole Cologne papyrus, some further reflections can be made in order to better explain its nature—“Unknown song” included—as far as authorship, authority, and authenticity are concerned.

In the system of oral communication prevalent in the archaic age, but not silenced in classical and even early Hellenistic times, a prestigious authorial seal must not be disregarded for the success of a new song trying to insert (and assert) itself inside the cultural, social, and literary arena. Precisely this mechanism could be seen in play when it comes to the “Unknown song.” The author actually responsible for its composition sought for his song the highest possible degree of diffusion, and therefore tried and successfully connected it with the authority emanating from a re-enacted Sapphic authorship:[47] a claim which would have been untenable in terms of philological authenticity becomes perfectly maintainable in the mechanisms of poetry that was orally and traditionally diffused in performance.

To sum up, the addition of the “Unknown song” would lead us to detect a second conception of authorship in the Cologne papyrus, a conception no longer authenticity-oriented, as the one governing the first section of “New Sappho” + “Song on old age,” but performance-oriented. By this we mean that the authorship of a given song was attributed by a given singer—and accepted by his or her public—through texts displaying traits that could easily be linked with a poetic tradition under a given name, taking advantage of the fact that archaic poetic traditions had no fixed boundaries but varied significantly in time, space, and socio-political contingency.

From a modern perspective, this conception of authorship, so tightly connected with performative issues originating in the archaic communicative system, is strongly opposed to the “authenticity-oriented” one, promoted by the Hellenistic editorial work and still valid nowadays. But as it happened, the passage from one conception to the other one must have been quite gradual: a smooth transition, which the Cologne papyrus itself shows in a crystallized form detectable to modern eyes thanks to the fortunate presence of two different writing hands.

46 See Nagy (1996) 42, with an application to the case of the Cologne Sappho in Pitotto (2008e).

47 See Nagy (1994–1995).

Thus not only does the Cologne sequence register new poetic fragments and possibly mediated traces of oral performative habits such as the relay and the proems;[48] it is also a very meaningful proof of the delicate shifting from old to new criteria to define authorship, authority and authenticity—old and new criteria that somehow mingle in a piece of evidence which, in its re-employment from Alexandrian edition (first hand only) to performative text (second hand included), proves both that different conceptions on the matters at stake existed and that these very same different conceptions could, temporarily, co-exist.

Bibliography

Aloni, A. 1997. *Saffo: frammenti*. Florence.

Aloni, A. 1998. *Cantare glorie di eroi. Comunicazione e performance poetica nella Grecia arcaica*. Alessandria.

Aloni, A. 2008. *Nuove acquisizioni di Saffo e della lirica greca*. Alessandria.

Aloni, A., and A. Iannucci. 2007. *L'elegia greca e l'epigramma dalle origini al V secolo*. Florence.

Bastianini, G., and A. Casanova, eds. 2007. *I papiri di Saffo e Alceo*. Florence.

Battezzato, L., ed. 2003. *Tradizione testuale e ricezione letteraria antica della tragedia greca*. Amsterdam.

Bernsdorff, H. 2004. *Schwermut des Alters im neuen Kölner Sappho-Papyrus*. ZPE 150: 27–35.

Bettarini, L. 2009. *Saffo e l'aldilà in P. Köln*. ZPE 165: 21–31.

Bierl, A. Forthcoming. *Sappho in Athens: Reperformance and Performative Contextualizations of the New Cologne Papyrus, or Old Age and Rejuvenation through Chorality*.

Boedeker, D. 2009. *No Way Out? Aging in the New (and Old) Sappho*. In Greene and Skinner, eds., 2009: 71–83.

Boedeker, D. Forthcoming. "Sappho Old and New (P. Köln 21351 + 21376, and P. Oxy 1787: An Overview of Texts and Contexts)." In *Symposium Lesbium: Poetry, Wisdom and Politics in Archaic Lesbos: Alcaeus, Sappho, Pittacus*, ed. A. Pierris. Oxford.

Burzacchini, G. 2007. "Saffo frr. 1, 2, 58 V. tra documentazione papiracea e tradizione indiretta." In Bastianini and Casanova, eds. 2007: 83–114.

Burzacchini, G. 2008. "Saffo, il canto e l'oltretomba." *RFIC* 135: 39–56.

Calderón Dorda, E., A. Morales Ortiz, and M. Valverde Sánchez, eds. 2006. *Koinòs lógos: homenaje al profesor José García López*. Murcia.

48 See above, section 5.

Christidis, A.F., ed. 2007. *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge.

Clayman, D. 2009. "The New Sappho in a Hellenistic Poetry Book." In Greene and Skinner, eds. 2009: 131–146.

Costas Rodríguez, J., ed. 2005. *Ad amicam amicissime scripta: homenaje a la profesora María José López de Ayala y Genovés*. Madrid.

Di Benedetto, V. 2004. "Osservazioni sul nuovo papiro di Saffo." *ZPE* 149: 5–6.

Di Benedetto, V. 2005. "La nuova Saffo e dintorni." *ZPE* 153: 7–20.

Di Benedetto, V. 2006. "Il tetrastico di Saffo e tre postille." *ZPE* 156: 5–18.

Faraone, C.A. 2005. "L'ultima esibizione di Orfeo: negromanzia e una testa cantante a Lesbo." In Guidorizzi and Melotti, eds. 2005: 65–86.

Fassino, M. 2003. "Avventure del testo di Euripide in papiri tolemaici." In Battezzato, ed. 2003: 33–56.

Faulkner, A. 2008. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. Oxford.

Ferrari, F. 2007. *Una mitra per Kleis*. Pisa.

Ferrarini, S. 2008a. "Commento linguistico." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 66–68.

Ferrarini, S. 2008b. "Il "carme ignoto": elementi erotici, elementi trenodici." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 141–147.

Funghi, M.S., and G. Messeri Savorelli. 1992. "Lo "scriba di Pindaro" e le biblioteche di Ossirinco." *SCO* 42: 43–62.

Gentili, B. 2006. *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica*. 4th ed. Milan.

Gostoli, A. 1990. *Terpander. Introduzione, testimonianze, testo critico, traduzione e commento*. Rome.

Greene, E., and M.B. Skinner, eds. 2009. *The New Sappho on Old Age*. Cambridge, MA.

Grenfell, P., and A.S. Hunt. 1922. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVI* [*1778–1828*]. London.

Gronewald, M., and R.W. Daniel. 2004a. "Ein neuer Sappho-Papyrus." *ZPE* 147: 1–8.

Gronewald, M., and R.W. Daniel. 2004b. "Nachtrag zum neuen Sappho-Papyrus." *ZPE* 149: 1–4.

Gronewald, M., and R.W. Daniel. 2005. "Lyrischer Text (Sappho Papyrus)." *ZPE* 154: 7–12.

Guidorizzi, G., and M. Melotti, eds. 2005. *Orfeo e le sue metamorfosi. Mito, arte e poesia*. Rome.

Hammerstaedt, J. 2009. "The Cologne Sappho: Its Discovery and Textual Constitution." In Greene and Skinner, eds. 2009: 17–40.

Hardie, A. 2005. "Sappho, the Muses and Life after Death." *ZPE* 154: 13–32.

Hinojo Andrés, G., and J.C. Fernández Corte, eds. 2007. *Munus quaesitum meritis: homenaje a Carmen Cordoñer*. Salamanca.

Karali, M. 2007. *The Use of the Dialects in Literature*. In Christidis, ed. 2007: 974–998.

Lardinois, A. 2009. "The New Sappho Poem. Key to the Old Fragment." In Greene and Skinner, eds. 2009: 41–57.

Liberman, G. 2007. "L' édition alexandrine de Sappho." In Bastianini and Casanova, eds. 2007: 41–65.

Lidov, J. 2009a. "The Meter and Metrical Style of the New Poem." In Greene and Skinner, eds. 2009: 103–118.

Lidov, J. 2009b. "Acceptance or Assertion? Sappho's New Poem in its Books." In Greene and Skinner, eds. 2009: 85–93.

Lobel, E., and D.L. Page. 1955. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*. Oxford.

Lotman, M., and M.K. Lotman, eds. 2011. *Frontiers in Comparative Prosody: In Memoriam Mikhail Gasparov*. Berlin.

Lundon, J. 2007. "Il nuovo testo lirico nel nuovo papiro di Saffo." In Bastianini and Casanova, eds. 2007: 149–166.

Luppe, W. 2004. "Überlegungen zur Gedicht-Anordnung im neuen Sappho-Papyrus." ZPE 149: 7–9.

Magnani, M. 2005. "Note alla nuova Saffo." *Eikasmos* 16: 41–49.

Méndez Dosuna, J. 2007. "The Aeolic Dialects." In Christidis, ed. 2007: 460–474.

Nagy, G. 1994–1995. "Genre and Occasion." *Métis* 9–10: 11–25.

Nagy, G. 1996. *Homeric Questions*. Austin.

Nagy, G. 1996. "The Athenian Reception of Sappho." In Greene and Skinner, eds. 2009: 176–199.

Nagy, G. 2011. "Reading the Homeric Hexameter Aloud While Following the Accentual Markings of a *Diorthōtēs*." In Lotman and Lotman, eds. 2011: 253–267.

Obbink, D. 2009. "Sappho Fragments 58–59: Text, Apparatus Criticus, and Translation." In Greene and Skinner, eds. 2009: 7–16.

Palmisciano, R. 1998. "Lamento funebre, culto delle Muse e attese escatologiche in Saffo." *SemRom* 1: 183–205.

Pernigotti, C. 2001. "Tempi del canto e pluralità di prospettive in Saffo, fr. 44 V." ZPE 135: 11–20.

Pitotto, E. 2008a. "La funzione comunicativa della 'nuova Saffo'." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 102–110.

Pitotto, E. 2008b. "Vecchiaia e (im)mortalità: la "nuova Saffo" e il tema della gloria poetica." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 132–139.

Pitotto, E. 2008c. "La "nuova Saffo": trascrizione diplomatica ed esegetica." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 14–21.

Pitotto, E. 2008d. "La "nuova Saffo": integrazioni e commento." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 42–58.

Pitotto, E. 2008e. "Quale Saffo?" In Aloni, ed. 2008: 157–164.

Pitotto, E. 2012. "Agoni, performance a staffetta e proemi: possibili tracce in P. Köln 21351+21376." In *Poesia, musica e agoni nella Grecia antica*, ed. D. Castaldo, F.G. Giannachi, and A. Manieri, 623–657. Galatina.

Puglia, E. 2008. "Appunti sul nuovo testo lirico di Colonia." ZPE 164: 11–18.

Raschieri, A.A. 2008a. "Sapph. fr. 58, 1–10 V." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 7.

Raschieri, A.A. 2008b. "Un'edizione "ossirinchita" dei lirici." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 117–119.

Rawles, R. 2006. "Musical Notes on the New Anonimous Lyrical Poem from Köln." *ZPE* 157: 8–13.

Rodríguez Somolinos, H. 2005. "Safo, Titono y la cigarra." In Costas Rodríguez, ed. 2005: 129–136.

Rodríguez Somolinos, H. 2006. "Los nuevos versos de Safo y el tema de la inmortalidad en la poesía." In Calderón Dorda, Morales Ortiz, and Valverde Sánchez, eds. 2006: 897–903.

Roselli, E. 2008. "Il mito di Titono ed Eos nel "carme della vecchiaia"." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 99–101.

Santamaría Álvarez, M.A. 2007. "La suerte de Titono: en torno al nuevo poema de Safo sobre la vejez." In Hinojo Andrés and Fernández Corte, eds. 2007: 785–794.

Stehle, E.M. 2009. " 'Once' and 'Now': Temporal Markers and Sappho's Self-Representation." In Greene and Skinner, eds. 2009: 118–130.

Trevisan, R.R. 2008. "Per una lettura musicale del 'carmine ignoto'." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 151–153.

Tsantsanoglou, K. 2009. "Sappho on Her Funeral Day." *ZPE* 170: 1–7.

Vandoni, K. 2008a. "Il 'tetrastico'." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 38–42.

Vandoni, K. 2008b. "Considerazioni sul 'tetrastico'." In Aloni, ed. 2008: 120–126.

Voigt, E.M. 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta*. Amsterdam.

Vox, O. 2007. "Sapph. P. Köln 21351, Fr. 1, 4–5." *Rudiae* 19: 223–228.

West, M.L. 2005. "The New Sappho." *ZPE* 151: 1–9.

Yatromanolakis, D. 1999. "Alexandrian Sappho Revisited." *HSCPh* 99: 179–195.

Yatromanolakis, D. 2008. *Sappho in the Making: The Early Reception*. Cambridge, MA.

Index Locorum

Aesch.–Vit.
53–54 Page 129

Alcaeus
34LP 255–256
129LP 255
307aLP 252
304V (=Sappho 44aV) 240–242, 259–260
308V 252–253
349aV 254

Alcaeus of Messene
Anth. Gr. 7.1 = 11.62–69 Gow–Page 213–215

Alcmaeon
DK 24B1 93–94

Alcman
fr. 1.39–43, 50 185
fr. 3 55–56

Anacreon
1.15–16 235

Anthologia Palatina
7.5 127
7.26/ ANTIPATER *EG* 14 236
7.153.1 111

Antiochus
FGrHist 555F2 93

Antipater of Sidon
7.14.4 235

Archilochus
fr. 25.1–8 162–164
fr. 122. 1–17 165–169
fr. 196a. 24–31W 174
Telephus Elegy, P. Oxy. LXIX 4708 170–173

Aristonous
to Apollo, *Fouilles de Delphes* 2. 191, *CA* 162–164, 41–48 52–54
to Hestia, *Fouilles de Delphes* 2. 192, *CA* 164–165, 14–17 54

Aristophanes
Thesmophoriazusae 471–472 59
Wasps 1219–1250 71–75

Aristotle
Rhet. 3.17.1418b28 166

Asclepiades
5.158.2 229

Bacchylides
3.95–96 92
13 150–157
17.128–132 40
19.1–14 49, 92
20.1–5 36

Callimachus
fr. 203 Pf./Iambus 13 132–134
Hymn to Artemis 1–8 258

CEG 24 260

Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi
13–14; West 2003, 340, 342 217
18; West 2003, 350–352 212–213

Cicero
Fin. 5.1.2 122

Corinna
fr. 655 = *PMG*. 1–13 36–37, 57–58

***Diegesis in Callimachi Iamb.* 1–fr. 203 Pf.** 134

Dioscorides
7.430/*EG* 31 233–234
7.708 130–131

Epitaphius Bionis
70–75 137
86–92 137

Erinna
AP 9.190 128

Euripides
Alcestis 993–996 271
Rhesus 921–925 201
Phoenissae 49–50 216

Hecataeus
FGrHist 1F1a 86

Herodotus
1.1 87
2.14 110

Hesiod
Theogony
10 180
22–34 84, 87, 198, 214
31 180
79 179
99–100 215
570 260
Works and Days
9–13 188
57 260
639–640 84
648–653 136

Hesychius
θ 90–91 Latte 202
θ 394 Latte 203

Homer
Iliad
2.484 17, 104
2.485–492 204, 210
2.594–600 84, 200
3.33 192
3.166, 398 186
4.357 192
5.385–407 168
9.413 118
24.247–287 274
Odyssey
1.337–338 210
4.140–143, 148 186–187
4.278–279 186
5.118–129 168
8.63–64 198
8.88–490 210
9.19–20 119
12.40, 43–44, 52, 188–191 210–211
13.254 192
14.228 163–164
15.390–484 210
22.347–348 199
23.62 187
24.93–94 118

Homeric Hymns
3. *to Apollo*
172 91
151–152 208
188–206 18
5. *to Aphrodite*
21–33 259–260
76–80, 286–288 208–209
33. *to Dioskouroi*
12–17 256
4. *to Hermes*
514–517 253–254
578 253
18. *to Hermes*
12 253

Horace
Ars Poetica 128–135 230
Odes 1.10 253

Isyllos
IG iv²1. 128, 37–56, 1–4, 23–25 37, 41–42

Lucian
Vera Historia 1. 3 94

Meleager
Anth. Gr. 4.1.155–158 222, 229–231, 233
5.136/*EG* 42. 4 232

Menander Rhetor
Διαίρεσις τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν 333.8–10 248
Διαίρεσις τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν 340.13–15 251

Nossis
AP 7.718 128, 131
AP 9.332 128

P. Köln
"New Sappho," P. Köln inv. 21351, col. 1. 1–11 268–269, 274–276, 280–281
P. Köln inv. 21351 276
P. Köln inv. 21351 + 21376, col. 1. 9 274
P. Köln inv. 21351 + 21376, col. 2. 3 274
"Unknown song," P. Köln inv. 21351 + 21376, col. 2. 9–23 269, 278, 280

P. Oxy.
1787.1–10 = Sappho fr. 58V 268–269, 274, 276
1787.10–21 and P. Köln inv. 21351 + 21376, col. 1. 12–15, col. 2. 1–8 265–266, 275, 279–280
1789, fr. 1.11 273
1800 207

Pausanias
9.29.6 205

Pindar
fr. 52b (= *Pae.* 2) 45–46
fr. 52d (= *Pae.* 4) 43–44, 47
fr. 52f (= *Pae.* 6) 35, 51, 54
fr. 52k (= *Pae.* 9) 46–47
fr. 52s (= *Pae.* 18) 48
fr. 59 52
fr. 70b 50
fr. 122 75–76
fr. 123 12–13
Isthmian Odes
1.1–10 50
2.1–16, 27–46 10–11, 21–23, 25–29
6.74 92
Nemean Odes
4.48–65 147
5.13b–46 142–146, 148–149
8.13–16 39
Olympian Odes
1.47–52 143–144
6.84–86, 89–90 58, 92
10.85 92
Pythian Odes
1.1–4 139
2.3–4 92
3.80–82 37–38
3.88–92 145
4.298–299 92
8.98–100 42

Plato
Ion 531e–534e 134
Laws 653d–654a 210
Phaedrus 259a–d 206–207
Timaeus 70d–72b 199

Plutarch
Alexander 15.7 130

***PMG* (*Poetae Melici Graeci*)**
889, 891–892, 897 75
900–901, 903–905 75

Pseudo–Bacchylides
AP 6.53/*FGE* 1 232–233
AP 6.313/*FGE* 2 231–232

Pseudo–Sappho
AP 6.269/*FGE* 1 226
AP 7.486–506 226–227

Pseudo-Simonides
AP 5.159/*FGE* 60 228
AP 7.25.1–2, 9 235
SEG 15 320(b) 1–4 201–202

Simias
AP 7.21.6 235

Sappho
fr. 1V 35, 247, 250
fr. 2V 267

Sappho (*cont.*)
fr. 5V 248–249
fr. 16V 163
fr. 44V 267
fr. 44aV (=Alcaeus 304V) 6, 240–242, 259–260
fr. 58V 269–271
fr. 114V 244
fr. 117bV 239

Solon
fr. 13.43 164

Sophocles
Oedipus Tyrannus 36, 130 216

Stobaeus
4.46.10 166

Suda
s.v. Σκολιόν 63

Susarion
West *IEG*² 94

Theocritus
Idyll
22 257
28. 1–7 124

Theognis
19–23 85, 101, 105–106, 108–109, 117–118
24–26 106, 113
27–28 87, 106, 108
39–40 103
51–53 103
69–70, 75–76, 79–82 113
87–88, 116–117, 119–126, 183–184, 190 114
237–254 101, 116–119
599–602 114
773–782 102
805–810 111
900–901 163
1071–1074 115

Thucydides
1.1 88
4.104 88–89
5.26 88

Timotheus
Persians 791.221–235 *PMG* 89–90
802 *PMG* 90

Index Rerum

Abdera 45, 47–48, 51–52, 56
Admetos song 74
Adonis 239, 250
adúnaton motif 167–168
Aegina 29n, 42, 52, 141–142, 144, 150–153, 155–156
Aesop 206–208
Aischines 75
Alcaeus 6, 64, 73, 77, 83n, 125n, 137, 239, 240–247n, 250–259, 261–262, 271
Alcaeus of Messene 213, 215, 218
Alcmaeon of Croton 93
Alcman 57, 83n, 126, 164n, 179, 181n, 185, 190–191, 240n, 245, 271
Anacreontea 226, 231, 235–236n
ancestors, authority of 37, 42
Anchises 209
antagonism, between human and divine performer 5–6, 197–199, 208, 211
Antiochus 93
Antipater 235–237
aoidós 186, 197–199, 204, 209–210
Aphrodite 11, 13, 34n, 35, 45, 51, 76–77, 124, 168–169, 179, 184–186, 208–209, 240n, 247, 249–252, 257n, 258–261, 267, 280
Apollo 12, 18, 26, 37, 42, 45, 52, 91, 93, 102–104, 133, 145–146, 148–149, 154, 180n, 189, 201n13–14, 205–210, 215, 240n, 242, 247n, 251–255, 259
archaic Greek poetics
  antagonism in 5–6, 197–200, 203, 205, 208, 210–211
  dual motivation in 199–210, 215
  synergy in 197, 199
Archilochus 5, 21n, 127–128, 137, 161–162, 164–170, 172–175, 224, 229, 281n
Argos 48, 50
Aristides 92n
Aristonoos 52–55
Aristophanes 59, 71, 217–228
Aristophanes' *Wasps* 71–72, 74
Aristotle 63–64, 77, 92, 166, 178, 194n
Artemis 6, 179, 215, 226, 240–243, 245, 247n, 251n, 257n, 262
Asklepios 37, 39, 42
Athens 18n, 26, 40, 49–51, 64, 72–73, 122–123, 129, 260n, 276–277
auteur theory 80
authenticity 1, 4–8, 107, 123, 125–126, 130n, 131, 134, 136–137, 178n, 198, 222–223, 233–234, 236, 239, 271–272, 282–283
author function 80, 83, 99
authorial attribution 6–7, 64, 70, 80–81, 85n, 95, 223, 225–226, 233, 240, 262, 282
authority 1–2, 4–6, 9, 14, 17, 19n, 23, 28–30, 34, 36–39, 47–48, 52, 56–57, 62, 81, 85, 87, 140–143, 145, 147–150, 155, 160, 162, 164–166, 168–169, 174–175, 180, 182, 185, 188, 192–194, 198, 200, 214n, 271, 279, 282–283
authorship 1–2, 4, 5–8, 50, 61–62, 80–82, 84, 86, 88–89, 93–95, 100, 106–107, 198, 223, 231, 236–237, 242, 262, 271–272, 282–283
autochthony 4, 126, 137

Bacchylides 5, 15, 36, 39–41, 48, 51–52, 92–93, 136, 139, 140–141, 150–158, 224, 229, 231–233
Bakker, E.J. 4, 16–17
Barthes, R. 80
Benveniste, E. 15, 17
biographical fallacy 244
Bion 128, 137
bribery/bribed 19

Calchas 216
Callimachus 55, 95n, 132–136, 139n, 226, 228n, 230n, 235, 251, 258
Calliope 179, 249n
capping 64, 116n, 213
Carnea 92
Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi 211–213, 216–217
Chamaeleon 178n, 182–183, 189
charis 19n, 184–185
chorality 180, 180n10, 183, 186, 190
choral projection 36, 202–203
chorus–audience interaction 30
choregós 29, 145, 152, 179, 185, 190

chorus 2, 5–6, 10, 12n, 15–30, 40, 42–44, 48, 56–59, 92, 102, 139–140, 142, 145, 147n, 150, 152–153, 155–158, 179–180, 182, 184–185, 187, 190–191, 194, 202n, 245, 250n, 258; *see also* mimesis, Stesichorus
chrysopteros 184n
Cicero 122–123, 130
citharody 90–92, 94–95, 105n
Contest of Homer and Hesiod: *see Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*
contest of wisdom 216
Corinna 36, 57, 58
Cratinus 91n
Crete 39, 67–69
Ctesias 94

deixis, deictic 8n, 15–16, 35, 38–39, 41, 51, 56, 59, 102–104
Delos 35, 40, 47, 50, 52, 181n
Delphi 20n, 26, 51–53, 64, 112, 201, 207, 211, 252
Demetrius 91n
Demodocus (character in *Odyssey*) 84, 139–140, 146, 180n, 183–185, 198, 261
Demodocus (elegiac author) 83n
Demosthenes 122, 255n
didactic 44, 108n, 188, 274
Dionysia 50
Dionysus 215n, 236, 251, 254–255, 257n
Dioscorides 130–131, 233, 234–235
Dioskouroi 48, 255–257
dissoi logoi 189, 192
Dodone 52
Douris 179
drama 14, 80n, 93, 95, 129, 190–191n43, 193

Elektryon 48, 50
Empedocles 193–194
epichoric 3–5, 96, 156, 180, 182n, 194
Epidauros 37, 39, 41
epigram 6, 111, 118–119, 126–127, 130–132, 201–202, 213, 215, 218, 222–223, 225–235, 237
epinician (victory ode) 2, 8–9, 12n, 15–16, 18n35–36, 20n, 27, 37–38, 41–42, 48, 50–52, 56–57, 92–93, 139–143, 145–150, 152, 154–157, 232, 246n, 279n
epiphany 182, 184, 256
Eratosthenes of Cyrene 217
Erinna 125, 128
Eris/*eris* 188, 192n
ethnic 83–84, 86, 88–89, 90, 92, 94; *see also* toponym
etymos/etetumos 182, 187–188, 192
eumachania motif 48
Eurycles 217–219
Eustathius 91n, 92n

fame 4, 6, 20n43, 35, 49, 51, 82, 85, 91–92, 102, 116, 118–119, 132, 155, 157–158, 210, 232, 234
first person/“I” 8–9, 15–18n35, 25–27, 29, 42–43, 45–46, 53, 56, 58, 81n6–82, 103–104, 140–144, 149, 153, 157, 171, 247, 249–250, 253n, 260
  ambiguity in 42–43, 45, 48, 53
  in *ego* statements 38
  collective 42, 44–48, 50, 53, 59
  poetic 48, 52
  typical 47, 50, 59
  female 55–58
  shift/slippage in reference of 41, 43–44, 59
Fischer–Lichte 14, 15, 17–18, 24
forgery 6, 227
Foucault, M. 80–81, 99–100
foundation 61, 63, 181, 189n34, 193–194
François Vase 179

gender–coding 14n, 21–22
genre 3, 5–7, 27, 30, 50, 52, 55, 61, 63–69, 74, 75, 77, 81, 82, 84n, 96n, 124, 126, 128, 130, 133–135, 139–140, 142–145, 156, 158, 182, 184, 189–190, 192, 194, 222, 225, 229–231, 235, 237, 240, 243, 246–247, 262
geography 41, 48, 59, 96, 123–124, 126–128, 130, 251n
gnōmē 5, 162–168, 172–174
gods 18, 28, 34, 38, 40, 53, 59, 90, 111, 114, 137, 141, 145, 154, 158, 163–168, 171–172, 174, 180–181, 199, 206, 208, 210, 214–215, 217, 241–242, 248, 250–251, 254–260, 276n
Goffman, E. 17, 19
Gorgias 194

Hecataeus 81n, 86–87
Helen 5, 178–179, 181–194
Hellenistic Poetry 4, 5, 123, 125–130, 136–137,

143n, 222, 223, 225–227, 229, 233–237, 256, 258, 271–273, 278, 282
Hephaestus 251, 254–255
Hera 147n, 247n, 254–255
Heraclitus 94n, 212–213
Hermes 251–255, 257n, 278n
Herodotus 20n, 81n, 83–84, 86–88, 110, 183n, 233n30–31
Hesychius 91n, 114n, 202–203
Hesiod 1, 5–6, 61, 82n, 84–87, 96n, 136–137, 141, 148n, 150, 174, 178–183, 186–187, 189n, 190–192, 194, 198, 200, 211, 214–219, 260
Theogony 82n, 84, 87, 99, 136, 141, 145–146, 178, 181, 188, 192n, 211, 214–215, 218, 260
Works and Days 84, 178, 188, 192n, 260
Hestia, hymn to 54, 257n, 259–260
himeros 184
Hipponax 83n, 132–133, 135–136, 235
Homer 1, 5–7, 17, 44, 61–62, 64, 83–84, 87, 91–95, 104, 108, 118, 126–129, 137, 139n, 141, 154–155, 157–158, 163–164, 168–169, 172–174, 178, 180–181, 183, 189–190, 192, 199–200, 204, 209–216, 218, 243n, 253nn44, 46, 274, 277
Homeric Hymns 141, 208,–209, 246, 251–262
Iliad 17, 84, 104, 141, 153–155, 184, 186, 192, 200, 203–204, 210–211, 254n, 258, 274
Odyssey 84, 118, 139–141, 146, 185–187, 192, 198–199, 211, 261
Homeric *epimerismoi* 243–244, 257
Homeric Hymn to Apollo 18, 52, 91, 93, 95n60, 180n13, 189, 208, 209, 251n38
Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite 208–209, 252, 257–261, 280
Homeridae 91, 94
humor 24, 163–165, 167, 169, 175
Hymnos 179
hymns 11, 53, 61, 235, 240–243, 245–253, 255, 257, 260–262, 275
cletic hymns 6, 240n, 246–249, 255, 277n
narrative hymns 6, 250, 252, 261–262

iambos/iambus 77, 94n56
iconography 179, 190–191
Iliad: *see* Homer
Ion of Chios 94n, 134–135
Ionians 40, 45, 47, 93, 133–135, 180–181, 208
Iris 184n, 250n
Isyllos 37, 39, 41–43, 54–55
Keos 40, 43, 44, 46, 49, 51, 52, 56
kitharody 180n, 189n
krembaliastys 186
Kurke, L. 11, 18, 25, 152
kyklios choros (circular dance) 38

Lay of Ares and Aphrodite 261
Lesbos 74, 90, 123, 132, 137
lieu de mémoire 122, 129–130
Linos 205–206, 208
local traditions 5 (as locally authored tradition), 123, 126
localization of myth 39
Locke, John 96n
Lucian 83, 94

Machon 130–131
maiden song 56, 151, 153–154, 156; *see also partheneion*
mandinadhes (sg. *mandinadha*) 67–69, 75
marriage 147–148, 156, 166–167, 169, 245, 259–260
matronymic 83, 90
Melampous 44
Meleager 6, 222–223, 225–233, 236–237
Midas epigram 111, 118–119
mimesis 103–104, 180, 186, 190
Minos 39
modern novel 96n
Mopsus 216
Muse(s) 2, 5–6, 11, 15n, 17, 20–21, 23, 27, 49–50, 56, 84–85, 87, 90, 104, 117, 127–128, 131, 133, 136–137, 139–146, 148–150, 156–158, 161, 164, 179–181, 183–184, 186–187, 192, 194, 196, 198–208, 210–211, 213–216, 218–219, 230, 232, 236, 247n, 249, 253n, 266–268, 279

names 49, 82–87, 88, 90–96
narrative 39–42, 56
narratology 16, 82n, 104, 139n, 142n, 146, 168, 174
narrator/poet–narrator 16n, 104, 140–143, 145–146, 148–149, 150–151, 153, 156–157, 161, 164–165, 168, 174, 175, 261n

natural world 167, 169, 174
Near East 85–86, 93–94
Nossis 5, 128, 131–132, 136, 227

obscenity 163–164
occasion 8n, 12n, 30, 38, 51–52, 65, 102, 181n, 188–189, 193–194, 232, 246–247, 250n, 257, 272, 275, 281
Odysseus 115–116, 118–119, 168, 185–187, 191–192, 211, 214
Odyssey: *see* Homer
Oedipus 216
oral poetry 1–2, 16n, 59, 61–62, 66, 81, 86n, 136, 188–189, 253n, 261, 282–283

palin 191–192
Panathenaea 9, 50, 281
Pandora 260
Panhellenic/Panhellenism 3–5, 7, 17, 26, 28, 45, 49–52, 55, 96, 102, 104, 116, 118, 155–157, 180, 182, 188–189, 194, 251, 254
Panhellenic festival 51–52
paradigm 2, 135, 161, 170–175, 181–182, 186, 208
Paris 183n, 184–185
Parmenides 193
partheneion 57, 179, 185, 190–191
parthenos 152, 155, 243, 259
pateres 36, 41; *see also* ancestors
patronymics 4, 82–84, 88–90, 93–94, 96, 113, 166
Penelope 187, 192
performance 2–9, 11–12, 14–20, 23, 29–30, 38, 41, 45–47, 50–51, 57–58, 63, 65, 70, 74–75, 77, 81, 86–87, 90–93, 95–96, 100, 102–104, 109, 113, 116, 126, 136, 139n, 140, 142, 145–146, 148, 150–152, 155, 157, 180, 181n, 188–191, 193–194, 197, 200, 202–205, 208–211, 216, 245–247, 250, 253n, 257n, 261n, 267, 270, 274–275, 277, 281–282
Phemius 84, 139n, 199–200, 210
phenomenal body 14
Pherecydes 94n
Philolaus of Croton 91n
Phocylides 83n
Phrasikleia, grave monument 260
Pindar 2, 5, 8–24, 27, 29–30, 35, 37–40, 43–45, 48–58, 64, 70, 75–77, 92–93, 128–129, 136–137, 139–142, 145–150, 155–158, 192–194, 197n, 205, 232n, 246n, 271
plagiarism 99, 107, 130n
Plato 83n, 122–123, 129, 134–135, 180n, 183, 189n, 191n, 194, 199, 206, 210, 217
Plutarch 87, 91n, 129n, 218
polyeideia 133–135
Poseidon 11–12, 39, 45, 149, 215, 259
prayer 34–35, 42, 52, 102–104, 232–233, 247–253, 255, 257n
presence 2, 5, 14, 23–24, 30, 50, 81, 107, 109, 114, 123, 145, 149n, 156, 164, 180n, 225, 236n, 248, 257, 260n, 272, 274, 278, 282
Presocratics 193
priamel 161, 168
Proclus 95n, 126n
prospective indexicality 103–105, 108–109
ps. Bacchylides 232
ps. Sappho 227
ps. Simonides 227, 229, 231, 233–235
pseudepigrapha/pseudepigraphic 6, 222–225, 227, 229, 231, 233, 235, 237
pseudonymity primary/secondary 6, 225, 228

reception 2, 6, 14, 16n, 26, 45, 81, 120, 158, 223, 225, 276
reliability (of narrator) 164, 174
reperformance 2, 3, 8, 9n, 16–17, 29, 45, 81, 86, 91, 93, 102, 156, 158, 272, 274, 281
rhapsode/rhapsodic 5, 52–53, 64, 91, 94–95, 246

Salamis 40, 126–127
Sappho 5–7, 35, 58, 64, 83n, 91, 123, 125, 128, 131–132, 137, 163, 186, 222–227, 229, 235, 239–250, 252, 255, 258–259, 261–262, 265, 267–268, 270–272, 275–282
seal 4, 85–86, 107–112, 113, 115–116, 119, 282
semiotic body 14, 18
Shield of Achilles 190
Sirens 186, 210–211
skolia 3, 63–66, 69–75, 77, 116n
Solon 83n, 164, 249
song
as *agalma* 38
and inspiration/Muses 5–6, 21–22, 36, 48–49, 56, 58, 84, 91–92, 203–206, 211, 218, 255n57, 268

and performance 2–3, 9, 18, 20, 34, 38, 57, 63, 95, 101–103, 113, 203, 205, 208, 210, 216, 245, 250
Sparta 36, 126, 183n, 186, 188, 233–234
Sphinx 184n, 216
sphragis 81, 85, 92, 105, 107; *see also* seal
Stesichore (Muse) 179, 180n
Stesichorus 5, 96n, 178–187, 189–194, 197n, 261n
Susarion 94
symposium 8–9, 11, 14n, 27, 30, 63, 66, 73–74, 76–77, 107–108, 113, 116n

Tanagra 37, 58
taxonomy, Alexandrian 39, 41
Telephus 161, 170–175, 281n
Teos 45
Terpander 64, 84n, 90–93, 95, 276
Thamyris 6, 84, 181n, 183–185, 198, 200–206, 208–209, 211
Thebes 46–47, 50, 92, 93, 128, 191n
Theocritus 55, 64, 124–126, 128, 137, 218, 256–257
Theognidea 4, 102, 105–106, 110–112, 115, 117, 119, 163
Theognis 4, 17, 22, 77, 81, 84–86, 91, 100–108, 110–114, 116, 118–119, 181n
Theogony: *see* Hesiod
theoria 47, 57, 112
Theron 9–10, 26
Theseus 39–40
Thespiae 202–203, 205, 251n
Thespis 203
Thrasyboulos 9, 11, 20, 22–25, 27–30
Thucydides 83n, 86–89, 217
Timotheus 86, 89–91, 105n
Tiresias 216
toponym 4–5, 89, 95, 101; *see also* ethnic
tragedy 49, 61–62, 129, 135n, 203
travel (as a poetic metaphor) 130

wisdom 25, 46, 48, 105, 108, 110, 113–114, 161–162, 164–165, 167, 174–175, 216
written fixation 188–190, 282

Xanthus (poet) 178n, 181
xenia/*xenoi* 11, 18–19, 19n, 29–30, 52, 92, 146, 185n
Xenokrates 9–12, 24, 25–28

Zeus 26–27, 29, 34–35, 42, 47, 51, 56n, 106, 113, 124, 127, 145–146, 148–149, 152, 162, 164–166, 168–169, 192n, 198n, 203–204, 209, 217, 234, 247n, 252–256, 259–260